

Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996."

This bill does not meet the priorities and needs of our Nation and people. It would undermine our ability to fight the war on crime; decimate technology programs that are critical to building a strong U.S. economy; and weaken our leadership in the world by drastically cutting funding for international organizations, peacekeeping, and other international affairs activities.

First, the bill represents an unacceptable retreat in our fight against crime and drugs. It eliminates my COPS initiative (Community Oriented Policing Services) to put 100,000 more police officers on the street. Already, this initiative has put thousands of police on the street, working hand-in-hand with their communities to fight crime. The block grant that H.R. 2076 would offer instead would not guarantee a single new police officer. That's not what the American people want, and I won't accept it. As I have said, I will not sign any version of this bill that does not fund the COPS initiative as a free-standing, discretionary grant program, as authorized.

The bill also eliminates my "drug courts" initiative. And it unwisely abandons crime prevention efforts such as the Ounce of Prevention Council and the Community Relations Service. I am also disappointed that the funding levels in the bill fall short of my request for the Drug Enforcement Administration, and OCDEF (Organized Crime Drug Enforcement Task Force). This is no time to let down our guard in the fight against drugs.

Second, the bill constitutes a short-sighted assault on the Commerce Department's technology programs that work effectively with business to expand our economy, help Americans compete in the global marketplace, and create high quality jobs. As we approach a new, technology-driven century, it makes no sense to eliminate an industry-driven, highly competitive, cost-shared initiative like our Advanced Technology Program (ATP), which fosters technology development, promotes industrial alliances, and creates jobs. Nor does it make sense to sharply cut funding for measures that will help assure our long-term growth and competitiveness—such as our National Information Infrastructure grants program, which helps connect schools, hospitals, and libraries to the information superhighway; the GLOBE program, which promotes the study of science and the environment in our schools; the Manufacturing Extension Partnership, which helps small manufacturers meet the hi-tech demands of the new marketplace; Defense Conversion; or the Technology Administration. And I oppose the bill's harmful cuts for the Census Bureau and for economic and statistical analysis.

Third, I am deeply concerned that this bill would undermine our global leadership and impair our ability to protect and defend important U.S. in-

terests around the world—both by making unwise cuts in funding for international organizations and peacekeeping activities, and by cutting programs of the State Department, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and the United States Information Agency. These cuts would impair our ability to support important activities such as the nonproliferation of weapons, the promotion of human rights, and the control of infectious disease like the Ebola virus. Moreover, sections of the bill include inappropriate restrictive language, including language limiting the conduct of U.S. diplomatic relations with Vietnam, that I believe infringe on Presidential prerogatives. And I cannot accept the provision that would cut off all funding for these agencies on April 1, 1996, unless the State Department Authorization Act and related legislation had been signed into law.

Fourth, the bill includes three additional provisions that I cannot accept.

It cripples the capacity of the Legal Services Corporation (LSC) to fulfill its historic mission of serving people in need—slashing its overall funding, sharply limiting the administrative funds LSC needs to conduct its business, and imposing excessive restrictions on LSC's operations. LSC should be allowed to carry on its work in an appropriate manner, both in its basic programs and in special initiatives like the migrant legal services program.

Section 103 of the bill would prohibit the use of funds for performing abortions, except in cases involving rape or danger to the life of the mother. The Justice Department has advised that there is a substantial risk that this provision would be held unconstitutional as applied to female prison inmates.

The bill also includes an ill-considered legislative rider that would impose a moratorium on future listings under the Endangered Species Act by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other agencies. That rider not only would make bad policy, it also has no place in this bill.

Finally, I would urge the Congress to continue the Associate Attorney General's office.

For these reasons and others my Administration has conveyed to the Congress in earlier communications, I cannot accept this bill. H.R. 2076 does not reflect my priorities or the values of the American people. I urge the Congress to send me an appropriations bill that truly serves this Nation and its people.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, December 19, 1995.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

Pursuant to the order of the House of today, consideration of the veto message is postponed until tomorrow, December 20, 1995.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE REPORT SHOWS BALANCED BUDGET WILL IMPROVE FAMILY INCOME

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, just a few minutes ago the Speaker of the House and the President concluded a meeting on which we hope there was substantial progress on negotiations toward a balanced budget.

I take this opportunity this evening to speak of a Joint Economic Committee report which shows clearly that there is a marked effect on family income and on the economic status of a family because of our movement which will eventually conclude in a balanced budget.

First, Mr. Speaker, it is important to point out, and this is extra from the report that I want to talk about today, that the individual share of the national debt that we have collectively accrued for each of the 280 million people who live in this country is about \$18,000. That is right, for every man, woman, and child who is a citizen of the United States of America, the individual share of the national debt amounts to just about \$18,000.

To bring that close to home, to let us see clearly what it means to each person, obviously, off in the abstract someplace there is a problem because there is an \$18,000 debt, but it is kind of out of sight until we understand that when we pay our income tax bill each year there is interest that must be paid on that \$18,000 debt.

If I went down to the bank to borrow \$18,000 and the person at the bank said, "OK, Mr. SAXTON, we will lend you the \$18,000, but you need to know that you have to pay interest on it," the interest on that \$18,000 note that I would take out would amount to somewhere, if it were a 7-percent note or thereabouts, it would amount to about \$1,060 a year that I would have to pay on that \$18,000 loan that I took out at the bank.

That is precisely what happens with the \$18,000 that we each owe the Federal Government. When we pay our Federal income taxes each year, on average, about \$1,060 goes to pay the interest on our \$18,000 share of the national debt. Of course, for an average family of four, that gets a little expensive, because \$1,060 times four comes out to about \$4,240 a year. So there is a definite economic impact on each and every individual and on each and every family.

Further, the Joint Economic Committee Report, which Members have

access to by calling my office, the Joint Economic Committee report that we published shows that there is a further impact on each American family that amounts to a very significant amount of money. As a matter of fact, it amounts to about \$2,308 a year. It is interesting to see how this report takes us there, because all of our families have certain things in common. If your individual family does not face these exact facts, you will at least be able to relate to them, because they are not uncommon.

For example, we believe that balancing the budget, and most economists believe that balancing the budget and Alan Greenspan believes that our balancing the budget will have a significant impact on interest rates. As a matter of fact, on most interest rates they are projecting about 2.2 percent lower at the conclusion of our 7-year balanced budget plan. So in the plan that we passed, and we provided for that economic benefit.

For a family that has a mortgage on their home, a \$100,000 mortgage, as is used in the case here, and the interest rate drops by 2 percent, it amounts to a whopping \$1,456 a year in savings on that home mortgage. So we jump right out front with a big savings for the individual homeowner of about \$1,456.

It also would not be unusual for a family of, let us say, three, as is the case in this example, for a family of three, it would not be unusual for that family to have a student loan. If we reduced the interest rate on that student loan, like we did for the interest rate on the home mortgage, we see here there would be an additional \$50 a year in savings, another significant amount, as we add up this total pie.

It would not also be unusual for a family like our family to have a car loan. That car loan at \$15,000 and a lowered interest rate by 2.22 percent would produce a savings of \$108 a year.

In the plan that we passed to balance the budget, as Members will recall, we had a \$500 per child tax credit. So in this family, you see, we have another 500 savings. There would also be some savings or some additional income because we know that if we put our fiscal house in order, it will have a positive effect on our economy. We believe that it will produce jobs, and we also believe it will produce higher rates of wages, higher rates of pay, so our economist friends projected that additional income would amount to about \$194 a year.

Adding all of these savings up from a better fiscal situation for our government and a better economic situation for our country, in actual savings for American families, we come up with a net savings of \$2,308 a year for this family of three.

The conclusion that we almost draw from this, Mr. Speaker, is that the facts presented in this analysis, which, again, is available by calling my office, lead to but one conclusion: The price of higher spending and greater debt accu-

mulation is far too high not to balance the budget. Refusing to bring spending in line with revenue will cost a typical American family \$192 a month, and over \$2,300 a year.

So I invite all of my colleagues and anyone else on Capitol Hill or around the country that is interested to give a call. We will be happy to send out a copy of this economic analysis, which shows these facts very clearly.

□ 1830

WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2359, ICC TERMINATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-425) on the resolution (H. Res. 312) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2539) to abolish the Interstate Commerce Commission, to amend subtitle IV of title 49, United States Code, to reform economic regulation of transportation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 558, THE TEXAS LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL CONSENT ACT

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-426) on the resolution (H. Res. 313) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 558) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Texas Low-Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET LACKS ADEQUATE FUNDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. OLVER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 month ago today we adopted a continuing resolution which was a commitment on the part of the President and the Members of Congress by a vast majority in both parties to achieving a balanced budget by the year 2002. That was 1 month ago today.

In the intervening 1 month, we have seen not a single one of the budget bills which is necessary to run the government for fiscal year 1996, not a single one of those bills has been signed into law. Indeed, three of them have actually reached the President's desk and he has vetoed them, including the Commerce-State-Justice bill, for which you just heard the veto message read. That veto message gives very profound and good reasons for why it was vetoed; and the other two, similarly.

However, the other three budget bills, including the major legislation

for the Labor, Health and Human Service Departments and Education Department, all of those have never even been taken up by the Senate; they are not even close to being passed.

Mr. Speaker, the continuing resolution that was adopted 1 month ago said that the President and the Congress shall agree, and agree to working toward a balanced budget that must, "provide adequate funding for Medicaid and education and agriculture and national defense and veterans and the environment," and continuing the quote, "Further, the balanced budget will adopt tax policies to help working families." That is a section of the quote from that continuing resolution.

Here we are 1 month later and what has been the progress on providing adequate funding? Let me take just a couple of these areas that have been so specifically spoken of in the continuing resolution that Members of both parties and the President agreed would guide how we would go about creating that balanced budget for the year 2002.

What about adequate funding for Medicaid? Well, what we know, Mr. Speaker, is that the Medicaid budget, as passed by the Congress and sent to the President, has \$133 billion worth of cuts in Medicaid. That is revised by the latest CBO numbers. Now, is that adequate funding for Medicaid?

Well, let us examine what it is that Medicaid provides for. It provides long-term care, Mr. Speaker, Long-term care is mostly for elders, for senior citizens in this country who have used every bit of their resources and are now destitute and need to be in nursing homes, need long-term care. So that \$133 billion cut comes out of long-term care for destitute elderly people in this country.

Number 2, it covers the safety net for poor families and where there may be no sympathy for poor people on the Republican side here, the legislation does provide health care, Medicaid does provide health care for children, for little children, little children who happen to be growing up in low-income statuses and surely deserve to have health care, as good a health care as my child, as good a health care as any child of any Member in this Congress has. But that, with the \$133 billion of cuts in Medicaid, is jeopardized.

Then the other major thing is disabled Americans, the most tragic cases of people that we have to deal with as members of Congress and among our constituents, people, mostly younger people, who have crippling birth defects or have debilitating or progressive diseases and need again the assistance from Medicaid that is provided to people who are disabled; and again, that \$133 billion of cuts in Medicaid taken from them.

What about the question of adequate funding for education? Well, the budget that the Republicans keep pushing as the correct budget is one that continues to take money from financial aid for college students, \$5 billion over 7