

the bill (H.R. 1058) to reform Federal securities litigation, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 988, ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. 104-66) on the resolution (H. Res. 104) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 988) to reform the Federal civil justice system, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 2, THE TERM LIMITS CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

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

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee anticipates meeting on Thursday, March 9, to report a rule for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 2, the term limits constitutional amendment.

The rule may include a provision permitting only the offering of amendments in the nature of a substitute, by Members who have caused their amendments to be printed in the amendment section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not later than Wednesday, March 8.

If Members are interested in having their amendment considered as a substitute for House Joint Resolution 2, they are encouraged to submit a summary and copy of the amendment to the Rules Committee before 5 p.m. on Wednesday, March 8 and testify before the Rules Committee, in addition to preprinting the amendment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments are properly drafted and should be titled, "Submitted for printing under clause 6 of rule XXIII," and submitted at the Speaker's table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 9.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Tax Technical Corrections Act of 1995. I am joined on this legislation by SAM GIBBONS, the distinguished ranking minority member of the Ways and Means Committee.

This legislation makes necessary technical corrections to implement the intent of prior tax legislation. Virtually all of the items in this bill were included in H.R. 3419, which passed in the House during the 103d Congress. However, the bill does include some new technical corrections.

I am introducing this legislation in order to give the public an opportunity to comment on it. Because I intend to mark up the technical corrections legislation during the Ways and Means Committee's consideration of the Contract With America tax provisions within the next 2 weeks, I would ask that any comments be submitted to the Ways and Means Committee as soon as possible.

The following are the new technical corrections which were not included in the prior legislation:

First, the bill clarifies that a U.S. shareholder's inclusion of a controlled foreign corporation's earnings invested in excess passive assets is treated like a dividend for purposes of the foreign tax credit limitation. Thus, like other amounts included in income with respect to a controlled foreign corporation, the inclusion would be characterized by reference to the underlying nature of the earnings and profits of the foreign corporation.

Second, the bill provides an inflation adjustment of the dollar amounts where a parent elects to include child's unearned income on the parent's return.

Third, the bill provides that the exclusion from income for a taxpayer's investment in an annuity contract applies to his entire investment in the contract, in the case of an annuity contract with a refund feature.

The bill also includes a number of new clerical changes, deletions of obsolete provisions, and date changes necessitated by the passage of time.

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

[Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak regarding the issue of our balanced budget amendment. The balanced budget amendment yesterday in the other body failed to receive the necessary votes required to pass this amendment on to the State legislatures. I believe that if it had it would have been one of the most rapidly approved constitutional amendments in U.S. history, that it would

have very quickly been approved by the required three-fourths of the State legislatures necessary according to our Constitution. I feel that this would have occurred because the people really do want this, and it really, truly is a bipartisan effort.

I was very, very disappointed to see our President using the issue of the scare tactic of Social Security cuts as a way of fighting this bill or fighting this amendment. Indeed, former Senator and Democratic Presidential candidate Paul Tsongas recently said it is embarrassing to be a Democrat and watch a Democrat President raise the scare tactic of Social Security to defeat the balanced budget amendment.

The greatest threat to Social Security is not the balanced budget amendment, but our continued deficit spending. We have a national debt of \$4.8 trillion and growing. Last year we spent \$296 billion just to pay the interest on the public debt. This year we will spend \$333 billion; next year it is anticipated that it will be \$364 billion.

The interest on the debt is one of the fastest growing accounts in the Federal budget. This is the greatest threat to Social Security and the greatest threat to every other element of the Federal budget.

□ 1445

Passage of the balanced budget amendment would have been the best guarantee of the integrity and protection of the Social Security trust fund. Let us remember that in 1993, when faced with a \$300 billion deficit and a desire to find funding for his new programs, President Clinton's tax-and-spend plan cut seniors' Social Security benefits by \$25 billion.

Also let us not forget, last October Alice Rivlin's memo where President Clinton's economic top advisors proposed tens of billions of dollars in additional cuts in Social Security benefits.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are not fooled by the rhetoric out of the White House about Social Security. The American people know that the White House is not concerned about the effects the balanced budget amendment would have on Social Security. The American people know that the real fear by the White House is that the balanced budget amendment would curb the growth of new liberal spending programs.

Mr. Speaker, a recent survey by CBS News/New York Times found that 79 percent, 79 percent of Americans favor the balanced budget amendment. Last week's poll by the Seniors Coalition found that 80 percent of those 55 to 65 favor the balanced budget amendment. Of those over 65, 71 percent favor the balanced budget amendment.

Mr. Speaker, seniors know the truth. The balanced budget amendment will stop the wasteful spending and reduce the threat that the deficit and growing interest payments cause to the Social Security trust fund.

Several weeks ago one of the President's chief economic advisors was asked if she had a family budget that her family lived by, and she responded "no." I think that this is part of the problem.

My family lives by a budget, and we plan for our future. Indeed when I was elected to this office, we had to budget for the cost of maintaining two households and we had to reduce our spending accordingly to compensate for those increased expenses that we were going to encounter.

We need to instill some of those basic fundamental rules that families govern their finances by. We need to instill into this body, the Government of the United States.

I believe this balanced budget amendment will become an issue in the next election of 1996, and I believe that we will see more Members elected both to this body and the one on the other side, more Members elected who will support the balanced budget amendment, and the will of the people of the United States will not be thwarted and that we will have a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BASE REALIGNMENT CLOSURE COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OXLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that Secretary of Defense William Perry's recommendation to the Base Realignment and Closure [BRAC] Commission to close Fort McClellan, AL, is a mistake with significant and dangerous ramifications.

With this recommendation, the Pentagon Jeopardizes the American soldier's ability to survive chemical warfare, breaks faith with hundreds of thousands of Alabamians at risk from their neighboring stockpile of aging chemical weapons, and seriously undermines the Chemical Weapons Convention and Bilateral Destruction Agreement.

Let me be specific about what's wrong with the proposed closure of Fort McClellan:

First, it contradicts two earlier directives of the Base Realignment and Closure Commission refusing closure efforts of 1991 and 1993. The BRAC Commission has ruled twice—and the President and Congress concurred—that the chemical defense mission performed at Fort McClellan is vital to our national defense and that the Army's recommendation violates the criteria of military value established by law. The 1993 Commission reprimanded the Pentagon for attempting a second closure—following the unsuccessful initiative of 1991—and warned:

... if the Secretary of Defense wants to move the Chemical Defense School and Chemical Decontamination Training Facility

in the future, the Army should pursue all of the required permits and certification for the new site prior to the 1995 Base Closure process.

The Pentagon has not acquired any of the required permits and certification; its only justification for the proposal is its assumption that the requisite permits can be granted to allow operation of the Chemical Defense Training Facility elsewhere.

Second, it would shut down the only facility in the free world where live agent chemical weapons defense training can be conducted for America and its allies. All United States services, 27 allied foreign nations, and the international CWC Preparatory Commission train at this facility. National and international experts have testified that relocation of the Chemical School and live agent facility would seriously disrupt our chemical defense program for a decade; even more importantly, they maintain, it is highly unlikely that such a move can be accomplished under today's environmental restrictions.

Third, it would destroy a chemical defense capability which is considered vital to the success of the Chemical Weapons Convention, whose article 10 guarantees chemical defense assistance to threatened signatory countries.

Fourth, it would dismantle a working chemical weapons program considered critical to the training of international inspectors for carrying out the requirements of the Chemical Weapons Convention.

Fifth, it would abrogate a written commitment of extensive Fort McClellan resources—medical, technical, and security personnel and facilities—to help protect the hundred thousand at-risk civilians in case of a chemical accident/incident during the storage and planned demilitarization of the acrosstown Anniston Army Depot chemical weapons stockpile—as required by the Bilateral Destruction Agreement and Chemical Weapons Convention. This commitment was made in the 1990 demilitarization permit request filed by the U.S. Army with the Alabama Department of Environmental Management [ADEM], which has authority over the demilitarization process. This commitment has been incorporated into numerous emergency response plans and agreements among Fort McClellan, Anniston Army Depot, and the surrounding community. It has been operationalized in chemical stockpile emergency preparedness drills throughout the local area under the direction of the Army and Federal Emergency Management Agency. Finally, it was reconfirmed to me in a meeting with and letter from Deputy Secretary of Defense John Deutch 6 months ago. ADEM has assured me that the loss of these resources—through closure of Fort McClellan—will virtually prohibit issuance of the permit.

I am shocked and disappointed that the Secretary of Defense who has broad responsibilities for the national and

international security of our country, has yielded to the bean-counters and numbers-crunchers in the bowels of the Pentagon.

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

[Mr. DREIER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ADMIT TURKEY TO THE EUROPEAN UNION

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago, prior to being elected to the U.S. Congress, my wife and I visited in the home of Tansu Ciller, now the prime minister of Turkey. Turkey has been a strategic ally of the United States for many years, particularly in our efforts to contain Soviet communism, and of course Turkey was an indispensable ally to the United States during the Persian Gulf war.

Today the country of Turkey is at a crossroads. A Kurdish insurrection is raging in the southeast. An Islamic fundamentalist movement is spreading throughout Istanbul and Ankara.

In the Islamic world there are two models of government; one is the Khomeini model in Iran, and the other is Turkey, the only country among 52 Moslem countries that is secular and democratic.

Turkey's most immediate problem is economic. In 1993, the Turkish lira began to engage in a sharp fall. Since then, investment has slowed down and inflation has reached an annual rate of 150 percent.

To help solve these economic problems, it is essential for Turkey's long-term stability that it be admitted to the European Union. The Clinton administration has acknowledged that they have not paid enough attention to this issue, and they are stepping up their activities.

Today, southern Europe is one of the most volatile areas in the world, and it is time for the U.S. Government to step up diplomatic activities to assure admittance of our longtime ally, Turkey, into the European Union.

If Turkey is not admitted, it will add fuel to the popular conviction that the West is rejecting Turkey out of religious bias.

Turkey and its people should be granted membership in the European