

REFERENCES TO COMMITTEE ON TECHNOLOGY AND COMPETITIVENESS IN HOUSE RESOLUTION 12 TO BE DEEMED TO BE TO COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any references to the Committee on Technology and Competitiveness in House Resolution 12 adopted on January 4, 1995, be to the Committee on Science.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On January 5, 1995, at the organizational meeting for the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee designated the following members to serve on the Joint Committee on Taxation for the 104th Congress, pursuant to Section 8002 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986: Mr. Archer, Mr. Crane, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Gibbons, and Mr. Rangel.

With best personal regards, I am

Sincerely,

BILL ARCHER,
Chairman.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution No. 1.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

READING THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states on the first day of Congress a Republican House will force Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else, cut one-third of committee staffs, and cut the congressional budget. We have done that.

In the next 93 days we will vote on the following 10 items:

One, a balanced budget amendment and line-item veto;

Two, A new crime bill to stop violent criminals;

Three, Welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence;

Four, Family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children;

Five, Tax cuts for families to lift government's burden from middle-income Americans;

Six, National security restoration to protect our freedoms;

Seven, Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without government penalty;

Eight, Government regulation and unfunded mandate reforms;

Nine, Commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits; and

Ten, Congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature. This is our Contract With America.

THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL POLICY TOWARD GAMBLING

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, in 1976 the Commission on the Review of a National Policy Toward Gambling issued its final report to Congress. In the 20 years since that time, however, much has changed. Gambling has gone from a \$1 billion-a-year industry in the United States to a \$30-billion industry. There was one State that legalized casino gambling then; today some form of gambling is legal in 48 of the 50 States.

A competition exists between the States. A competition exists between the States and foreign countries. A competition exists between the States and Indian tribes, whereas 20 years ago no Indian tribe was authorized to have legalized gambling.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the establishment of a new Commission to pursue a national policy toward gambling in the United States.

□ 1110

CONGRESS MUST LIVE WITH BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as taxes increase, as government regulations get more and more burdensome, as the bureaucracy becomes more and more expensive, America's middle class has had to tighten their belts. Even though they are out there working as hard as they can, year after year, because of our actions in spending in Congress, they have to squeeze in a little bit more.

But now it is our turn. It is time for us to match our revenues with our expenses. We need to have a balanced budget amendment. Our last balanced budget was in 1969, and since then Congress has decided that it could defy

gravity by spending indefinitely more money than we take in.

The balanced budget amendment will put an end to this fantasy. It is not a new concept. State, city, and county governments all over America have had a balanced budget. They have to have one by law. It is now our turn. If we had had one all along, we would not have the \$4.5 trillion debt we must now contend with.

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Americans want a more open and honest government. Last week I voted with the majority to open our Congress to ensure public hearings. But also last week the Committee on the Budget rejected on a party line vote a requirement requiring Congress to tell how the balanced budget amendment would be implemented.

We should require this House to specify those cuts to reach that balanced budget. The Congressional Budget Office has said it would cost \$1.2 trillion in cuts by the year 2002 to reach that balanced budget. In the name of honesty, openness, and constructive planning, we must set that course to achieve the goal.

The people need to know how and what and when these cuts will be made. We talk about a Contract With America. Let us not forget our contract with our senior citizens in 1935 for Social Security, our seniors for health care in 1965, and our veterans that provide them benefits for their sacrifices for their country.

The people of these United States will remember that our contract is renewed next year unless we tell them how we are going to fulfill the contract we agreed to.

BAN UNFUNDED MANDATES ON STATES

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, today the Senate is considering a bill to ban unfunded mandates by Congress for States like Kansas. We must join with them so that no longer will Congress be able to mandate that States do things without funding. No longer will Congress attempt to balance the budget on the backs of the States.

It took the Republican majority in the House and senate to bring this important issue to a vote. We will finally enact what State Governors like Kansas Gov. Bill Graves and State legislatures have been asking for years, to relieve the arrogant burden of denying money to States to pay for the Federal Government's mandates.

Just as the American people have called for a ban on unfunded mandates, they have also called on Congress to balance the budget. Starting now we will work to control our spending and our own budget. It is what the people want, and what we intend to give the people.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, like the energizer bunny, the Christina Jeffrey story keeps going and going and going. Yesterday Speaker GINGRICH's spokesperson, Tony Blankley, said that they did not know that Christina Jeffrey believed that a Holocaust class should reflect the views of the Nazis.

Today we read in the Atlanta Constitution that Ms. Jeffrey told Speaker GINGRICH's staff a month ago. But even worse was today's revelations of why Ms. Jeffrey thought she was fired. Yesterday Mr. Blankley said that Speaker GINGRICH held Ms. Jeffrey in high regard, and today we find out she believes that she was told she had to go because "There would be marches and demonstrations and fundraising efforts to raise money to turn over the House to Democrats."

What was Speaker GINGRICH's motivation in firing Ms. Jeffrey? Was it because he disagreed with her views, as he should have, or was it because of adverse publicity and bad political consequences?

Yesterday I praised the Speaker for quickly firing her. I stand by that, but there are many questions that must, must be answered.

PASS THE BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WELLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to respond to the Democrats' call for specific cuts in the Federal budget. They well know that Republicans have pledged to consider all proposals except for Social Security. Their insistence is an effort to divert attention from the real issue. Congress can only tackle the issue of how to balance the budget after we decide to balance the budget.

The Democrats' desire to place the proverbial cart before the horse led the American people to give their House to the new Republican majority. We must not let empty partisan rhetoric sway us from the task we have been sent here to do; namely, to bring fiscal responsibility to Washington. We owe the American people that much. It is time to stand and deliver by passing the balanced budget amendment.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the house for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a new chapter opened today in the history surrounding the hiring and the firing of the House Historian. Today, the former Historian reveals to the Atlanta Constitution that she had indeed informed the Speaker's office about her views on the teaching of the Holocaust before she was hired. This directly contradicts the statements that had been made by the Speaker's office. The Historian was fired because her opposition to funding a course on the Holocaust was wrong because it did not reflect what she called the Nazi point of view or the Ku Klux Klan point of view. Such extremism from the person hired to chronicle an important part of the history of our government is an affront to this body and to all Americans.

How could a person known to have such extreme views on this issue and one that is so sensitive to so many Americans, how could that person have been hired? But perhaps we should not be surprised. This is not the only office that the new Speaker has turned into a partisan political tool. The same thing was done in selecting the House administrator. I fear that we are seeing the beginning of a dangerous pattern.

PUBLIC HOUSING RENT REFORM

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, as we debate the reform of our Nation's welfare system, our deliberations must include a close examination of the federally mandated system of calculating rents paid by residents of America's public housing.

The evidence is striking. The current system of establishing rents in public housing is set by bureaucrats in Washington. It provides no flexibility to provide incentives for residents to make a better wage or even find work.

In most cases, if a resident of public housing obtains gainful employment, they end up with less disposable income than if they had stayed on welfare. That is right, less money by going to work. Is it any wonder we have generations of people who are addicted to the public dole?

In the last Congress, this body passed a housing bill which included a provision which I sponsored, entitled the Rent Reform and Empowerment Act, which would reduce these disincentives through a system of income disallowances and ceiling rents. Unfortunately, it was killed in the other body.

Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing this important legislation. It is time we applied a little common sense. And keep in mind it has been this Government that has imposed some of the highest tax rates on America's poor.

COMMENTS ON HOUSE HISTORIAN

(Mr. LEWIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, not even the Speaker of the House agrees. His choice of a Historian for this House is unfit to serve. There is no room in this House for bigotry, racism, or anti-Semitism. I commend the Speaker for realizing his error, acting quickly, and firing his appointment.

The operation of this House, the recording of its history, should be non-partisan. The House Administrator, the House Historian, these appointments should be made with the best interests of this House in mind, not the Speaker, not the Speaker or one political party.

Last week the American people were promised a new openness, a new way of doing business. But so far it looks like business as usual.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican House, this is not a Democratic House. This is the people's House. Mr. Speaker, the people deserve better.

□ 1120

H.R. 359

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I am asking my colleagues to join 67 Members of the House in cosponsoring H.R. 359. This legislation will prevent a major rip-off of American inventors and investors by ensuring that Americans have the 17 years of patent protection which was their right prior to the passage of the GATT implementation legislation last year.

Hidden in that implementation legislation was a provision not required by GATT that was slipped into the implementation legislation. The provision dramatically reduces the number of years of patent protection for American citizens, permitting foreign nationals, foreign and international corporations to use American technology against us in the world competition without so much as paying royalties to American inventors and investors who created the technology.

H.R. 359 will stop the rip-off and perfect the GATT language by purging this provision from part of the GATT that should never have been part of it in the first place.

IS THE HOUSE MOVING TOO QUICKLY?

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, are we moving too fast without taking proper precautions that will be costly in the future?