

they want to do, with no monitoring and being able to spend the money however they want.

I think Americans have been proud of the school lunch program. It has been a program that works, it has been a program that has been efficient, it has had national standards, and we have seen the results through our military recruitment. I would hope this body reconsiders what happens and try to undo some of the damage we have seen by the block grants that are coming forward.

REPORT ON UNITED STATES MILITARY OPERATIONS IN HAITI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, it is day 162 of the occupation of Haiti by United States troops. The costs are about \$850 million, heading to \$1 billion, but every American can feel safe and secure that the Haitian military is not going to invade us.

Congress put itself back into the Haiti policy loop last year, after some of the concerns we had about the way it was being handled by the White House, by requiring reports. I have the report from February 1 submitted by the White House to Congress. The report, a bit self-congratulatory, documents the success of operations in Haiti to date. Indeed, it does that. It is a short report.

What it does not do is document the problems we are facing and the risks we are facing and the costs we are obligating our taxpayers to at all, and that is something that needs to be done.

I read from the report. It says the purpose of our mission down there was to use all necessary means to secure the departure of the coup leaders. Many will remember they have left, and I think we have primarily former President Carter, General Colin Powell, and Senator SAM NUNN to thank for that. Certainly the threat of the force of our U.S. military was part of that. But the fact is, maybe we did not need to send 21,000 of our assault troops to that friendly, neighboring country to accomplish the removal of those coup leaders.

But let us go on to the next point, restoring the legitimate, democratically elected Government of Haiti to power. The administration is claiming great success for that. Well, they have not restored the Government of Haiti to power. They have restored President Aristide to power in his White House, but we no longer have a Parliament in Haiti, which is an essential part of government, and we certainly do not have much of a judiciary system. Any student of the Constitution in this country will understand that a functioning democracy has to have those three branches of government, which they do not have in Haiti.

You also have to say that in Haiti that the Haitians are not the power. The Government of Haiti is certainly not the power. It is the U.S. military that is the power down there now. To say that it has been restored to the Haitian people is a further mistruth, because it is only to select Haitian people.

If you go to Haiti today and say how do you feel about the United States troops, you will get a number of answers, depending on who you talk to. The people who are pro-Aristide will say we are very friendly. The people who are not pro-Aristide, which is about 30 percent of the country or so, will say we think everything the U.S. Government is doing is backing Aristide, and it is very pro-Lavalas, and we are being identified with one man's power, one man's presidency in that country, and that is a dangerous place for our foreign policy to be.

But moving forward from those points, when we talk about whether or not the Haitians can run Haiti yet, it is clear they cannot, and even though we and the United Nations have declared that it is a secure and stable environment, we saw just last week that they had a massacre as soon as our troops left one of the enforcement areas, the police station up in a town called Limbe. Our troops left, the mob went in, grabbed the people out of the station, beat them to death, burned them, and at least had the decency to bury them after that.

That is an isolated incident, I agree. But I suspect as our forces leave, we need to be on guard. To say things are secure and stable may be stretching the point just a little bit the way things are in Haiti today.

That police force is supposed to provide some of the stability. Some observers now are saying they are being politicized, deliberately politicized by President Aristide; he is bypassing passing some of the screening process put in to build a professional police force. This is a serious problem and we need to know a lot more about it.

I think that the report that we are talking about, restarting the Haitian economy, which is very important, signals something very curious for us as American taxpayers. We have about \$1.6 billion pledged for our military support, and another \$1 billion pledged for some type of aid support over the next year or so, I think would be a fair statement, and yet it is all at the top. It is not down at the bottom. We are not getting the money and the expertise down at the working level on the front lines of commerce.

Talking to businessman after businessman after businessman, our program there is misdirected, and that is something we have to refocus very quickly, especially for that kind of money.

We are paying a very heavy price in Haiti as taxpayers, as I said. What are we spending money on? We are buying troops from other countries. We are paying foreign soldiers, paying them at

the rate of about \$1,000 a month to foreign governments, who are taking a handling fee to put their troops into Haiti as part of a joint task force. Our troops down there are being used right now for things like garbage collecting, writing speeding tickets, making traffic flow work, that kind of thing.

In this report, interestingly enough, the White House says we must have to cover a \$2.6 billion shortfall in our defense spending because without it the net effect will be a significant decrease in overall military readiness.

In other words, our military readiness is at threat because our troops are picking up the garbage in Haiti. We need a fuller report from the White House.

SSI EXTENSION TO GUAM AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to correct the fundamental flaw in the Republicans' welfare reform proposal contained in the Contract With America. Their proposal would substantially undermine the public assistance program by sending block grants to the States, limiting the Federal spending, and dropping millions of children and adults from the rolls, thus jeopardizing them to a future of poverty, joblessness, and hopelessness.

The Republican proposal to restructure the welfare system is fraught with provisions to exclude noncitizens from receiving many public assistance programs. For instance, they would be ineligible for Medicaid, SSI, and a variety of food, housing, and health care programs. The denial of these services to low-income children and families is cruel and would only exacerbate their poverty and dim their hopes for a better future.

While there should be strong and vigorous debate on the inclusion of noncitizens, perhaps it is not clearly known that not all U.S. citizens are included in the benefits. Let me repeat this: Not all U.S. citizens are eligible for SSI.

I am concerned about a major omission in the majority's welfare reform bill, which fails to address the need for Supplemental Security Income coverage for the territories. Since the implementation of the SSI Program in 1974, the citizens of the insular areas have been excluded from participating in this program. The Republican bill continues to deny SSI benefits to the U.S. citizens living in these offshore areas. The bill I am introducing today would extend the SSI Program to Guam and the Virgin Islands, and I understand that the extension of SSI to American Samoa and Puerto Rico will be addressed in separate legislation.

The gross disparity of denying SSI to the territories is particularly significant, coupled with the fact that the total Federal expenditures for all cash assistance programs, including the Aid to Families with Dependent Children and the adult assistance programs, are capped each year for the insular areas. For Guam, the Federal cap is \$3.8 million per year. In fiscal year 1994, Guam spent under Federal mandate approximately \$15 million to provide Federal assistance to eligible low-income individuals.

Today, I am seeking a quality of treatment for the people of Guam and the Virgin Islands in comparison with those residents of the 50 States and the District of Columbia. Citizenship in this country and the privileges associated with it should not be measured by geographic choice, in residency, or the size of one's pocketbook. Whether one chooses to live in Alaska, Florida, or the Virgin Islands, a federally funded program should be accessible to everyone. However, if you are residing in Agana, Guam, or St. Croix, Virgin Islands, you are not eligible for SSI benefits.

Finally, providing SSI benefits to Guam and the U.S. Virgin Islands will provide the well-being of low-income aged, blind, and disabled residents of our island economies who are dependent on imports from the States and foreign markets.

Guam and the Virgin Islands have been associated with Uncle Sam for many years. In a partnership associates share in the benefits of the association. Uncle Sam, it is time to share the wealth and the responsibility of caring for your partners. We on Guam have fulfilled our responsibilities by giving up one-third of our island for national security, giving our sons and daughters to fight in wars all over the world, and giving loyalty to the American flag every day of our lives.

And here is the fundamental craziness in SSI eligibility, both from the past and into the present. The Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas is included and eligible under current SSI regulations, and they are 40 miles from Guam and have been associated with the United States since 1976 and became citizens at that time. Guam, whose people have been under the U.S. flag since 1898 and became citizens in 1950, and the Virgin Islands, whose people came under the flag in 1917 and became citizens in 1927, are ineligible.

Why the loyalty and dedication of the citizens of these two territories goes unrewarded while others assume benefits, including noncitizens resident in this country? Who knows. But we want to fix it, and this is one of the things that we can fix, and we can fix today.

I urge my colleagues to join me in extending the SSI benefit to the two insular territories of Guam and the Virgin Islands.

SUPPORT THE RISK ASSESSMENT AND COST-BENEFIT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Risk Assessment and Cost-Benefit Act. We must put an end to the overreaching bureaucrats whose choking regulations threaten American people every day. We must make the first rule of our regulatory system common sense. The bill will force Federal bureaucrats to use a little more common sense.

The examples of Federal regulatory nonsense are too numerous for me to mention here. Some are painful and some are just plain absurd. A pair that come to mind include an OSHA rule that cost the dental industry over \$2 billion but produced no measurable improvement in worker safety, or then there's OSHA's attempt to declare bricks a potentially poisonous substance—yes, bricks. I imagine it is only a matter of time before some bureaucratic genius issues an advisory that says, "If Americans stopped driving their cars, there would be a lot fewer auto accidents."

Mr. Speaker, the way to bring sensibility to Federal regulations is to apply risk assessment and cost-benefit analysis as in our bill. The EPA and the FDA's own estimates suggest that their new regulations cost the economy as much as \$12 billion each year. Our bill will force these bureaucrats to prove that the cost is worth the benefit we receive from those regulations. It will force agencies to focus on the most dangerous risks to society. It will force regulators to look at the effectiveness of \$10 million solutions versus \$100 million solutions.

Our opponents will argue that this legislation will roll back existing regulations. They will argue that this bill will endanger the safety of Americans. Mr. Speaker, the EPA Director, Carol Browner, went so far as to say, "20 years of protection of our children, our air, our land, and our water are being rolled back in the dead of night." Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Speaker, EPA Director Browner's remarks only show how desperate Federal bureaucrats are to hold on to the coercive power they now have over American business and the American people.

The main principle of our regulatory reform system must be common sense. The Risk Assessment and Cost-Benefit Act will force Federal bureaucrats to focus their regulatory efforts on what will benefit Americans the most. It will prevent Federal bureaucrats from forcing industries to spend millions, even billions of dollars without proving with good science the responsibility of that action. It will force Federal bureaucrats to give cost-effective solutions the same consideration and the same

weight as the extravagant ideal solutions they pursue today.

Mr. Speaker, it is past time that we recognize that our resources are not boundless. If we are to save ourselves from the debt that is crushing us every day, we must force Federal regulators to behave responsibly and ease the burden they place on our economy.

□ 1250

THE BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

(Mr. TIAHRT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Senate will vote on the balanced budget amendment and they are one vote short. That is an issue that is very much needed by all Americans.

We must balance the budget. We must provide this discipline to end the deficit spending and to shrink Government and reduce the tax burden.

Over the last 25 years we have been unable to exercise the self-discipline of a balanced budget. So passage of the balanced budget amendment means an ending to the liberal welfare state just like passage of regulatory reform meant an end to the nanny state.

The balanced budget amendment is not only important to this generation, Mr. Speaker, but it is important to the next generation. We are \$4.5 trillion in debt. The balanced budget amendment starts a glide path that gets us down to the year 2002. It is a 7-year plan.

My oldest child Jessica is now 14 years old. In 7 years she will be 21. She will be out of college. She will be paying taxes and contributing to society. So it will be up to her generation to pay off the debt because we have spent their money. If it takes as long to pay off the debt as it took for us to spend it, to raise the debt, than she will be nearly 50 years old.

One vote away. Mr. Speaker, we must have this discipline. Because if we do not get this discipline, Americans, I fear, will lose faith in this economy and in this system of self-governance, just like Mexico recently lost faith in their economy. It caused a near economic collapse, and we are still struggling with the solution to that problem.

We just ask that the Senate join with the Republicans in the House and all across the Nation who want a balanced budget amendment because we are committed to stopping the out-of-control spending and the out-of-control regulation. We are working hard for real change and for keeping our promises.