

(d) in the case of a fact-finding trip or international travel, a description of the proposed itinerary and proposed agenda of substantive issues to be discussed, as well as a justification of the relevance and importance of the fact-finding trip or international travel to the staff member's official duties.

(3) *Reasonable travel and lodging expenses.*—After receipt of the advance approval described in (1) above, a staff person may accept reimbursement by an appropriate sponsoring organization of reasonable travel and lodging expenses associated with a speaking engagement, fact-finding trip, or international travel related to official duties, provided such reimbursement is consistent with the Rules of the House of Representatives. (In lieu of reimbursement after the event, expenses may be paid directly by an appropriate sponsoring organization.) The reasonable travel and lodging expenses of a spouse (but not children) may be reimbursed (or directly paid) by an appropriate sponsoring organization consistent with the Rule of the House of Representatives.

(4) *Trip summary and report.*—In the case of any reimbursement or direct payment associated with a fact-finding trip or international travel, a staff person must submit, within 60 days after such trip, a report summarizing the trip and listing all expenses reimbursed or directly paid by the sponsoring organization. This information shall be submitted to the Chairman (or, in the case of the minority staff, to the Ranking Minority Member).

c. *Waiver.*—The Chairman (or, where appropriate, the Ranking Minority Member) may waive the application of section (b) of this rule upon a showing of good cause.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I take this hour, or I was going to take this hour, to highlight the fact that I am introducing a bill establishing a moratorium on Federal regulations, but I think I will take at least the beginning of my time to answer some of those on the other side of the aisle in this obviously orchestrated theme and strategy to try to kill the balanced budget amendment.

All the talk that has gone on on this floor and over the weekend about how we should show how we are going to balance the budget before we actually vote on a balanced budget amendment is just that, it is nothing but talk. Most of the people that have spoken against the balanced budget amendment today and over the weekend, including the President of the United States, are against the balanced budget amendment. Those Members that are more senior that have had an opportunity to vote on a balanced budget amendment have voted against the balanced budget amendment. This is a very feeble and frankly I say a really silly attempt to kill the balanced budget amendment, try to stir up the American people against the balanced bud-

et amendment, and, of course, is the cynicism of politics by fear that goes on in this place and in this town all the time. Any time anybody wants to come down here into this town and into this well and wants to impose fiscal responsibility on the Federal Government, they run out people and horror stories about, oh, we're going to turn widows out in the street and children are going to go hungry.

The point is, ladies and gentlemen, is this government is headed into disaster. We are running up debt on our grandchildren that is immoral. Unless we impose discipline on this Federal Government, we will never balance the budget, and they do not want to balance the budget because they love printing money to pay for their social programs.

It sounds ridiculous to me, in fact I challenge the Democrat side of the aisle to show us where you laid out what you would do to implement the equal rights amendment. Everyone over there wants to pass the equal rights amendment to the Constitution but when did you lay out how we were going to do it before we passed it? It is crazy.

We have to have the discipline of the balanced budget amendment first to force this Congress to make those tough decisions. Let me tell you something: We are going to show the American people a balanced budget and how we are going to get to the balanced budget amendment.

It is politics as usual. They want to control the whole issue right here in Washington, DC. By calling for laying out the cuts before we pass a balanced budget amendment, that means they want the control and they do not want the American people to have a say in it. We want the American people to have a say in it.

What is going to happen in this House at the end of January, we are going to pass a balanced budget by this House and we are going to send it over to the Senate, they are going to pass a balanced budget amendment, then it is going to be sent to the States for ratification by three-fourths of the legislatures and the governments that are closest to the people, the State legislatures.

While that is going on, and that is a process we have to go through, we are going to lay out a budget this spring that will show the American people how we will get to a balanced budget by the year 2002.

We have to have the discipline first. Then we will tell you how we are going to do it while they are ratifying it in the States. Then the people will decide whether they want the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, not a bunch of politicians in Washington, DC.

That is what the elections were on November 8. That is what they were all about. The American people are tired of this place making all their decisions for them.

That is what we are going to do. We are going to pass the discipline first, then we are going to lay it out and tell how we are going to get to a balanced budget amendment. Then hopefully the States will ratify it and we will be on the road to a true balanced budget in this Nation. That is what the people want.

I am sorry it went off like that because my staff is just probably tearing themselves apart. I was supposed to come down here to talk about regulations and I will do that now.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to introduce the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, legislation establishing a moratorium on Federal regulations.

Regulations are out of control, and only going to get more so under this administration. Measured by the number of pages in the Federal Register, in which all new regulations are published, Mr. Clinton's first year saw the most regulatory activity since President Carter's last. The page total for 1993 was 69,688 pages, the third highest total of all time.

This corresponds to an increase in the number of regulatory bureaucrats. From 1985 to 1992, regulatory staffing increased by over 20 percent, to almost 125,000 employees. However, the number of Federal Government employees devoted to implementing regulations was 126,815 in 1993—an all-time record. And the administration's budget for fiscal year 1995 proposed increasing that number to 129,648.

The average American had to work full time until July 10 last year to pay the costs associated with Government taxation, mandates, and regulations. This means that 52 cents of every dollar earned went to the Government directly or indirectly.

On November 8, 1994, the American people sent a message to Washington. They voted for a smaller, less intrusive Government. An important step toward reaching this goal is curtailing these excesses of Federal regulation and red-tape that are now estimated to cost the economy over \$500 billion annually. This burden leads to job loss, slower productivity growth, reduced competitiveness, and higher prices for consumers. Small businesses—the job-creating engines of our economy—spend at least a billion dollars a year filling out Government forms, according to the Small Business Administration.

Although regulations are often well-intended, in their implementation too many are oppressive, unreasonable, and even irrational. I have given these examples before, but I would like to give them again because they make my point so well:

One company that inadvertently wrote a name on line 18 rather than line 17 was fined \$5,000 by the EPA.

A drycleaner was fined for not posting a piece of paper listing the number of employee injuries in the last 12 months, when in fact there were no injuries during that time.

Detailed safety data sheets are required for such dangerous materials as Joy dishwashing liquid, chalk, and even air.

OSHA has classified children's teeth as hazardous waste.

On November 10, the Clinton administration released its Unified Agenda of Federal Regulations, which outlines its plan to pursue over 4,300 rulemakings in the next fiscal year. It is difficult to believe that all of these 4,300 rulemakings have to be completed and implemented before the 104th Congress can take the opportunity to consider regulatory reform. The American people will not tolerate a rush to new regulations by the entrenched bureaucracy before the 104th Congress can even attempt to make appropriate changes in the law.

Proof of this sentiment is evident in the recently formed Project Relief, a broad-based, nonpartisan coalition of over 200 organizations and individuals representing businesses, trade associations, citizen advocacy organizations, social groups, think tanks, minority groups, state and local officials, and others. These various interests have come together in this push for comprehensive reform and are working closely with both the House and the Senate on this front.

In order to have the opportunity for orderly consideration of regulatory reform issues by the whole Congress—Republican and Democrat Members alike—the new majority leadership respectfully asked the President on December 12, 1994, to order a moratorium on all Federal rulemaking, with appropriate exceptions. Sadly, the President declined to issue such an order.

We have, therefore, no choice except to deal with the regulators ourselves, and we do so with this legislation. The Regulatory Transition Act of 1995 proposes the moratorium that the President refused to order, indicating that it is to be business as usual in the Federal bureaucracy. That is not the message sent by the American people in the last election.

Through the introduction of this bill and the hearings that will be held on it, the administration and others will be given the opportunity to justify why all of the regulations placed into effect since the date of the last election should remain in full force without the possibility of reconsideration as a result of any regulatory reforms enacted by the 104th Congress.

I would like to make clear that the bill does not suspend any existing or new regulation that responds to an emergency or is necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety, or which is essential to the enforcement of criminal laws. The President, acting on the written request of an agency head, is charged with the responsibility for making this determination.

Additionally, the bill does not suspend regulations that reduce or

streamline regulatory burdens rather than imposing new ones.

Some bureaucrats forget that it is the Congress that makes the laws, delegates the power to issue regulations implementing the laws to the agencies, and controls the standards and processes by which the regulations are made by the agencies.

Make no mistake. A Federal regulation is a law that can affect life, liberty, and property of Americans. Fairness, justice, and equity must be reflected in the laws of the land, including Federal regulations.

The 104th Congress should undertake a thorough review of Federal regulations, starting with the way they are made and enforced, and make such adjustments to the statutes of this land as are necessary to reflect the mandate of the American people. No such thorough review has been possible for some 40 years. It is a daunting but welcome task. It cannot be achieved overnight, nor even in the first 100 days of this Congress, but we can make a start. That start will be impeded if legions of new regulations go into effect before even the initial consideration for regulatory reform and relief can be given.

Introducing this bill with me today is Congressman DAVID MCINTOSH, who is the chairman of the Government Reform and Oversight Committee's Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs. I look forward to working with him on this very important issue.

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 Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ARCHER, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FOGLIETTA in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. BERMAN.

Ms. WOOLSEY in two instances.

Mr. TRAFICANT in three instances.

Mr. CONDIT.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. STARK.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. GEPHARDT.

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

Mr. EWING.

Mr. POMBO.

Mr. WOLF.

Mr. DAVIS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, January 11, 1995, at 11 a.m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Submitted January 4, 1995]

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Natural Resources. Legislative and review activities of the Committee on Natural Resources during the 103d Congress (Rept. 103-890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Final listing of all bills and resolutions introduced on January 4 and January 5; supercedes listing appearing in the Record on those days.

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Submitted January 4, 1995]

By Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. THOMAS (for themselves, and Mr. MCHALE, Mr. HOYER, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. ARCHER, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. BAKER of California, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARR, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. BONO, Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. BURR, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CANADY, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CHRYSLER, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. COX, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CREMEANS, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. DREIER, Ms. DUNN of Washington, Mr. EHRlich, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. EWING, Mr. FLANAGAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FRISA, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HOEKSTRA,