

even this is a little low for the White House.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get on with making the Federal Government smaller, less costly, and more efficient. That is what the people want, and it is what the Republican majority is all about.

REPLACE WELFARE WITH WORK

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of a strong work program to replace our welfare system in this Nation. What the American people will get with the Republican bill is the illusion of a work-based welfare system. This bill wishes for more work that the Republicans have submitted to the Committee on Ways and Means, but it does not require work. It offers weaker work requirements than current law.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to say to the American people we are going to replace welfare with work. This bill does nothing to hold States accountable for performance. As if by magic, expect more families on welfare to go to work. The work requirements in their welfare bill will not work and serve the welfare population of this Nation. If it does not happen, then what we do in the Republican bill is we punish the children of the welfare population.

This bill is mean-spirited and shortsighted, and it is just plain mean on children in this country, and we ask for an alternative package, and that package would respond to the human needs of the people.

REPUBLICAN BILL IS STRONG ON WORKFARE AND STATE RESPONSIBILITY

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, you know, I rise very seldom this year to speak to the House for 1 minute or any time, but I hear comments about—like the former speaker had to say about the work program in the welfare reform bill the Republicans put out. It raises the hair on the back of my neck. You cannot get any stronger than telling people, and allowing States to even make it stronger, 2 years. Two years of welfare, then you go to work. You engage in some work program. And in 3 more years you are off.

How much stronger can you be? That is 100 percent. One hundred percent of those who are on welfare today in 5 years will be in a work program or they will be off of welfare. How much stronger can you get?

It is rhetoric coming from the minority side. That is all it is. They are trying to confuse the public. The Republicans have a strong welfare-work-State responsibility bill.

COMMENTS ON MEXICAN LOAN GUARANTEE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Uncle Sam will not help Washington, DC, because of waste, fraud, and mismanagement. Let's see if I understand this: Down there in Mexico there is waste, fraud, mismanagement, corruption, larceny, kickbacks, bribes, and conspiracy. There is even an armed revolution to boot. But Uncle Sam can find \$53 billion to bail out Mexico.

Tell me, Mr. Speaker, who is now formulating the policy for the United States of America? The Three Stooges, or what? Beam me up. When Uncle Sam can say "Sorry, Charlie," to Orange County, CA; Washington, DC; Youngstown, OH; and New York but find \$53 billion for Mexico, that says it all, Congress. Think about it.

SCHOOL LUNCH SCARE PROGRAMS

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I watched with utter disbelief yesterday as not only the Democratic leadership, but the President of the United States, stood up and scared every single school-aged child in this land by telling them we are going to starve them to death.

Mr. Speaker, once again the Democrats have not told the whole truth. We are not cutting school lunches. We are cutting Federal bureaucrats. Under the Republican plan, spending for school lunches will increase 4 percent at least next year, and administrative overhead will decrease dramatically.

I know it is hard for the Democrats to shake the Big Government ideology they have called for for so long, but Republicans are charging ahead to make the Government smaller and less costly. While we are busy seeking bold new solutions, all the Democrats can do is carp about tired myths and defend the failed and bankrupt welfare state.

NEW WELFARE PROPOSALS LACKING IN FAMILY VALUES

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about family values lately, but what kind of family values are contained in the Contract With America, which proposes massive tax breaks for the wealthiest people in this country, billions of dollar increases on military spending, including the discredited Star Wars Program, and at the same time cutbacks on programs desperately needed by the weakest and most vulnerable people in our society?

I was especially outraged yesterday by a subcommittee's elimination of the LIHEAP Program, which provides low-income people, including many senior citizens, heating subsidies in the wintertime. In my State of Vermont, over 20,000 households, including many senior citizens, take advantage of that desperately needed program.

Tax breaks for the rich, increases in military spending, and cutbacks on heating programs for the elderly and the poor. What family values.

FEED THE KIDS, NOT THE BUREAUCRACY

(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, the Democrats' scare tactics never cease to amaze me. First they told the senior citizens if we pass the balanced budget amendment, you will never get another Social Security check. Next they went after the politicians. If the President has a line-item veto, you will never get a pork-barrel, I mean an economic development project, in your district again.

Now it is the school kids. If we consolidate 16 different food and nutrition programs, lay off hundreds of bureaucrats and make the system more efficient, kids will go hungry.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you, how hungry will these kids be when our country is broke? This debate is not about feeding the kids, but eliminating fat cat bureaucrats who have been picking the best helpings off children's plates for too long. Feed the kids, not the bureaucracy.

REMEMBER OLD-FASHIONED IDEAS

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues like to say we have a "new Congress." They are right.

A new Congress that loves the photo ops of passing a so-called crime bill, but votes to take police officers off our streets. A new Congress that loves the headlines of talking about moving people from welfare to work, but scoffs at the idea of paying Americans a livable minimum wage.

Yes, we have a new Congress. But it has forgotten a lot of old-fashioned ideas. Like the idea of giving those in need a helping hand—instead of pointing the finger of blame. The idea that we should help our constituents take back their streets from criminals. The old ideal that perhaps we should give our kids a hot lunch in their schools.

And the idea that every American who works hard and sweats and toils every day deserves to be able to feed their family and own their home and send their kids to college.

I know that our new Congress does not care much about these old ideas. But I guess we Democrats are sort of old-fashioned, so we will keep right on fighting for them.

MORATORIUM ON ESA

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague, Mr. CONDIT, in offering a bipartisan amendment that will extend the Regulatory Transition Act to cover listings and designations of critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment is necessary to protect the most endangered species of all, the American landowner. It is time that Congress gave hard-working, tax-paying American families the same rights as blind cave spiders, golden-cheeked warblers, and fairy shrimp.

Burdensome regulations imposed under the Endangered Species Act are reducing our landowners, farmers, and small business owners to a rare breed.

This year, Congress has the opportunity to amend the Endangered Species Act to balance the rights of landowners.

Until Congress reauthorizes the Endangered Species Act, we must put a stop to the out-of-control regulators and protect American property owners. Later today, we will offer a bipartisan amendment to extend the regulatory moratorium on Endangered Species Act listings and critical habitat designations. I urge my colleagues to support the bipartisan Condit amendment.

ONE LAW FOR EVERYONE

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, in 50 days this Congress has passed only one bill that has been signed into law by the President. That measure quite rightfully demands that the Members of this Congress observe the same laws that apply to everyone else. The American people rightfully expect that Members will shoulder the same responsibilities as ordinary citizens and meet the same standards of behavior as ordinary citizens.

But what a difference a few weeks can make. I am deeply concerned to learn that a Member of this House who stands accused of serious ethical transgressions, indeed a cloud of alleged improprieties that threaten public confidence in this House, that Member has actually threatened to shield himself by introducing legislation to require his accuser to pay both his legal fees and the expenses of the Ethics Committee that is investigating him.

Mr. Speaker, does obtaining special legislation to immunize one's self

sound like what an ordinary citizen does? No, it does not. But that is indeed what the Speaker of the House has threatened to do.

I suggest that not intimidation, but more speech is the way to deal with this problem.

□ 1045

IN SUPPORT OF THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Regulatory Transition Act.

Mr. Speaker, there is a frantic effort underway on the part of the administration to frighten the American public and this body about what those of us who would protect private property rights are trying to do. For years, Big Government has disseminated the message that the public needs of Washington, DC, to take care of it—that without Washington, DC, no one will look out for its health and well-being; that without Washington, DC, no one will protect its clean air and clean water; that without Washington, DC, no one will know what to do because only Washington, DC, knows what's good. Something may sound ridiculous but, as the message goes, it's coming from Washington, DC, so it must be a smart idea, because after all, doesn't Washington, DC, know best?

There was a different message sent in the last election. Washington, DC, doesn't know best. Regulation after regulation comes down the pike—micromanaging every facet of the daily lives of individuals and the daily operations of businesses. The people said, "Enough." The administration responded by preparing some 4,300 new regulations to get through under the closing door.

If we are truly representing the American people, we must keep this from happening. The administration is trying to send a message that life as we know it will fall apart if these regulations don't get through. That is an unfortunate scare tactic. But let's show everybody concerned that the regulatory monster isn't vital to our existence, but it actually threatens our way of life as we know it. Let's cast a vote for smaller, smarter Government and defy those who are trying to scare the American public and this body into continuing with business as usual.

A COURSE IN ETHICS

(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, this is the people's House. This is what democracy is all about.

According to Timothy Mescon, dean of Kennesaw State College, political and academic resources were commingled in the preparation of the course he cotaught with Speaker GINGRICH. This led Dean Mescon to admit to the Los Angeles Times this week that "In hindsight, we would never do this again. There's no question about that * * * I feel horrendous about this thing, and it's embarrassing."

Lois Kubal, a graduate student involved in the design of Speaker GINGRICH's so-called course, says that "the class at KSC was intended to be partisan and very political."

Even more disturbing, course content was sold to corporate sponsors. According to a request for funding, potential donors were promised they could participate or work directly with the leadership of the project in the course development process in exchange for their \$25,000 or \$50,000 check. This is how the course is taught, the game is played, at Newt University.

Mr. Speaker, the charges keep piling up. We need an outside, independent, counsel to investigate the serious ethical charges hanging over the head of the Speaker of the House, and we need one now.

MORE ON THE REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about the Regulatory Transition Act. This is a critical act for us and it is only a starting point, because over the past years we might as well clear out the floor of this Congress and let unelected bureaucrats come sit, take our places. They have been running the Government, lock, stock, and barrel. They have made laws. And the United States EPA, Mr. Speaker, might as well have come into the Ohio Valley and Youngstown, OH and Cleveland, OH and taken the food off the tables of people. They have over extended their arm.

It is time to make normal, common-sense, rational ideas to protect people but not to have the mismatch that we have had that has strangled the ability of blue-collar working people to literally just survive in the Ohio Valley and industrial parts of the State of Ohio.

So we want to protect people, but we have now the opportunity to correct the faults that have occurred of an overstretched bureaucratic arm.