

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 39; the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

 HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

 AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the current resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 34—authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus anniversary commemoration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, for an explanation of his request.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for a brief performance of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus on or about April 3, 1995. This event is intended to be a salute to the 104th Congress and a celebration of the 125th anniversary of the Ringling Brothers Circus. This event promises to be a welcomed diversion for Members, their families, staff, and the general public, and will be free of charge. It will feature traditional circus entertainment, complete with recorded music.

Ringling Brothers will assume all expenses and liabilities in connection with this event, which will be presented under conditions prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board. These officials are currently meeting to discuss the details of this event.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's expla-

nation, and I too support this resolution. The circus provides family entertainment for millions of Americans and families, and we are pleased to be able to be a part of this annual event and bring it to the Capitol Grounds for this salute to the 104th Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus celebrates its 125th year on April 10, 1995, during its engagement in our Nation's Capital;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus represents a 200-year tradition of circus in America;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus demonstrates to children of all ages that humans and animals can work together in harmony and cooperation; and

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus is committed to its goal of educating the people of the United States as to the need to conserve endangered species: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION.

Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as "Ringling Bros.") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, with circus elephants and performers, on the Capitol Grounds on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that Ringling Bros. shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, Ringling Bros. is authorized to erect upon the Capitol grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONS.

Ringling Bros. shall not represent, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of Ringling Bros. or any product or service offered by Ringling Bros.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

 GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just adopted.

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

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 will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. GUTIERREZ 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 Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

 PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority side will still yet have a unanimous-consent request to make, and if we go into the special orders, will that be too late for them to do so? I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is checking on that now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that normally business requests are not entertained once special orders have begun.

 □ 1830

 RENEWAL OF REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and subcommittees be able to sit during the 5-minute rule tomorrow: Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee

on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on House Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on National Security, and Committee on Resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when this matter was previously brought up, I am not going to object, but I do want to make the point, and I think it is a point that bears consideration.

This is a very serious matter that is going to be considered by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight tomorrow. It is a matter of great controversy. Now we have considered a lot of matters of great controversy when we have been under the 5-minute rule. My side has agreed to this, and I am not going to object because of that. The leadership on my side has consulted with their leadership and has agreed.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point under my reservation that this is a change of great magnitude for middle-income workers, that we expect to carry out our policies. The proposal is approximately a 10-percent tax increase. Now, if it were on any other people in America, the committee would not only not meet, they would be vigorously opposed to such an action. I am told that the proposal will be changed somewhat and that, in fact, the money will not be a savings, but will be applied to the retirement itself of Federal employees. But it has been projected at an \$11 to \$12 billion cut out of the pension benefits of some 2 million civilian Federal employees. That is a big hit on Federal employees. I am opposing that proposal, and will oppose it tomorrow, and am hopeful that it will not be approved.

Now the ranking member of the subcommittee from which that came is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]. He has raised many reasons why it should not be approved, and at this time, under my reservation of objection, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The reason why we have reserved the right to object is that we are marking up a bill that has been given very little consideration. The minority had been notified only days in advance of a markup and, in fact, of hearings. We are rushing to judgment on a retirement system that, in fact, does not need tampering with, that, in fact, was fixed in 1986 after 2 full years of deliberation, and now we are going to change that within a matter of days with very little reflection.

Most of the Members of this House have no idea what we will be marking up tomorrow and bringing to the floor

very shortly. What we did in a bipartisan way, after 2 years of study in 1986, was to institute a new retirement system. That retirement system is working perfectly. It is fully funded. The old retirement system is not fully funded, but in fact it is being phased out. So there is no reason to mess with that, and, when we passed legislation in 1986, we told Federal employees, we told our colleagues, we told the American public, we were not going to change this system, and now we are asking for unanimous consent to mark up a bill that completely changes it in a radical and punitive manner.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we did this in 1986. Was the gentleman here in 1986?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not here, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] was not here.

I would tell the gentleman from San Diego and I would emphasize that we have a responsibility to maintain the contracts that we make with the American people, that this Congress does. We are standing in the seat and assuming the responsibilities of our predecessors, and, when the U.S. Congress makes contractual obligations, it is our responsibility to fulfill those obligations. I am glad that the gentleman from California made that point, made the point that we have a responsibility to fulfill our commitments, and we are going to abdicate that responsibility and violate that commitment in the markup tomorrow. At least that is the intent of getting unanimous consent to be able to meet during the legislative session. That is why we have brought up this reservation.

Granted, it applies to Members of Congress; that is not the reason for the objection. Members of Congress will pay more into their retirement, and they will get much less back out of their retirement. But the people that are taking the biggest hit are Federal employees who will pay almost a 12-percent tax increase in the CSRS plan. It will go from 7 to 9½ percent and, in the new plan, from 0.8 to 3.3 percent after we assured them this would not happen.

That is why this should be objected to, and I yield back to the gentleman who yielded to me, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] whether he was here. He, of course, perhaps knew, or at least may have known, that the gentleman from Virginia was not here.

As the gentleman well knows, I was here, and I would tell my friend from California that this was a bill that was passed by the Democrat House, by the Republican Senate, and signed by President Reagan. This was an attempt

to put, as my friend from Virginia has said, the pension system on a sound basis. As the gentleman from California clearly knows, President Reagan, his OPM director, OMB and the Republicans in the U.S. Senate, then headed by Mr. DOLE, as he is now heading that Senate, as the gentleman knows, made a determination that it needed to be changed, so we created the FERS system, which is for new employees and new Members of Congress, and we kept in place the Civil Service Retirement System. As the gentleman from Virginia has pointed out, that was a bipartisan fix of a pension system.

It created two systems, a new system, and left in place the old system. It did not deal, as I know my friend knows, with the military retirement system, and I would presume that my friend would not want us to arbitrarily and capriciously, with very short consideration, change the military retirement system, and the reason we should not do that is we have a moral obligation to our friends who served in the military, who served their country, and under one consideration, they did not do it for this reason, but we told our friends in the military, "This is the deal, this is the pension system that we're going to give you," and I am going to yield to the gentleman in just a second, but I was intrigued with my friend's question, so I wanted to fully respond.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree, and I do not disagree totally with what the gentleman is doing. My only intent was the gentleman was sounding like he helped create the bill. He, nor I, was there, and that is the only issue I brought.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman makes a point, neither of them were there.

The point I want to make in all seriousness, and we are almost ready, but, further reserving my right to object, the point I want to make is that this is a very serious proposal which will adversely affect middle-class working Americans, and I have a lot of good friends on their side of the aisle with whom I agree some of the time, but very frankly this is not a partisan issue in terms of those who are being focused on it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and, as the gentleman mentioned, others share our concerns that we not in a short term, without serious consideration, without extended debate in the subcommittee or in full committee, without an opportunity for persons to be heard who will be adversely affected, impose on middle-class working Americans in effect a 10- to 12-percent tax increase.

Now we do it by increasing their pension from 7 to 9½ points. That is a 2½ point—about \$750—\$750 on the average

Federal worker, and that is akin to about a 10-percent tax increase. That is something we ought not to do in the fashion that we are doing it. That is the purpose of us rising.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to object because there has been an agreement, and very frankly we understand, even if we objected, they could make a motion tomorrow to do the same thing, and I am convinced they would prevail, but I hope we look at this matter very closely. My friend from California said he may agree with me if we affected military retirement in this fashion. We would not want to do that. I say to my colleagues, don't do it to civil service employees any more than you would do it to military personnel in this fashion.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania who asked unanimous consent request, I ask that the Members of Congress realize what this means to them or, more importantly, to their staffs, in fact to all the committees' staffs, all the people who work up here on the Hill. They will see their retirement contribution requirement increased by about 12 percent, from 8 to 9½ percent. On the base that is about a 12-percent increase. They will see their accumulated retirement reduced by 2 percent. So we hit them on the front end in terms of what they contribute and on the back end in terms of what they are able to accumulate toward their retirement, but when we compare that to Federal employees, there was actually a 35-percent increase. That is 2½ percent over the current base of 7 percent, a 35-percent increase over what they are currently paying, plus there will be a reduction in what they are able to receive.

And in the Thrift Savings Plan, which was designed to fix this, which we were committed to sustaining and to not changing, there will be a reduction in the employer contribution, the Federal Government's contribution, from 5 down to 3 percent. This will affect the quality of life is everyone in the Federal Government who is dependent upon a Federal retirement, whether it is in the legislative branch, or the executive branch, or the judiciary branch.

This is a profound change in the assumptions that people have made when they seek and obtain Federal employment and when they plan their retirement years, and yet we get unanimous consent to mark up a bill with a few days notice, and bring it to the floor and make such a profound change with very little consideration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and just in closing:

We ought to remember approximately 90 percent of private sector employees in America make no contribution to their retirement systems, none. Federal employees are now making a 7-percent contribution. Now, the Federal

employee pension system is a better system than most private sector pension systems. I mentioned that Ronald Reagan signed the bill in which we formed this working with a Republican Senate and a Democrat House.

□ 1845

In 1990, A Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, working with a Republican President, George Bush, tried to reform and did reform the pay system. And the reason President Bush and his administration agreed to that was because they believed, correctly, that pay was not comparable, and they further believed that you ought not to modify in any way the pension system until you got pay comparable.

President Bush then signed the locality bill, the Federal Comparability Pay Act, and said in signing that that he hoped to put the pay and retirement system on a solid base. That is our point. We ought to retain what we have. We ought not to change it and we ought not to do it in this way.

But, again, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will not object because of the fact that my leadership has agreed to this process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

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 will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will take up an historic piece of legislation, the welfare reform bill. There has been a lot of discussion about spending on welfare in the context of that bill and there is going to be a special order later this evening which will discuss that further.

I want to talk just for a few minutes not about spending as such, but about the relationship between spending on welfare and the effectiveness of our welfare system. And I am going to do that first by looking at this graph, which is very informative. It shows us how welfare spending has grown since the Great Society programs were announced in the mid-1960's.

What you can see from that, Mr. Speaker, is that in approximately 1965 we were spending about \$30 billion in Federal and State spending on welfare. And that by 1992, we were spending close to \$300 billion on welfare, or a tenfold increase in how much we were

spending on welfare. So we had an explosion in welfare spending on the Federal and State level in the last 30 years.

But look, Mr. Speaker, at what has happened to the poverty rate during that period of time. In 1948, it began a steep decline, down to about 15 percent in approximately 1965, at the same time as welfare spending has exploded and it has stayed the same. It has gone up slightly since 1965.

This vast explosion of welfare spending has brought us not a decrease in poverty but, in fact, a slight increase in poverty and we are entitled to say, why? Why at the same time as we have increased, exponentially, spending on antipoverty programs has poverty stayed the same when it was declining beforehand?

The reason is because of the incentives in the welfare system. The welfare system pays this money only on the condition that people have a child without being married, earlier than they probably otherwise would, and without having a job.

so what the welfare system is doing is destroying work and marriage and family and responsibility. And if you destroy that, it does not matter how much money the government gives somebody, you are not going to get people out of poverty. It is like bailing water out of a boat with one hand while you are pouring water in with the other.

I want to go to the other chart. I only have a few minutes. This is a projection of what is going to happen with welfare spending in the future.

Now, this is a baseline before the welfare reform bill that we are working with that we will be debating next week. You will see that welfare spending is projected to go up from \$300 billion in 1992 to close to \$520 billion by 1998. By that time, it will be almost twice what we spend on defense.

Now, the CBO numbers are not out, Mr. Speaker, so I did not put it on here. The Republican welfare bill we are going to debate allows welfare spending to go up about half that much by the rate of inflation.

And I want to close with a couple of comments. In the first place, nobody in Washington is talking about cuts in welfare. The bill we will debate next week will allow welfare to grow at approximately the rate of inflation. If you hear anybody talking about cuts in welfare, they are either very much mistaken or they are simply uttering something that is not true.

The second point that these two graphs graphically show is how much we are spending on welfare is a lot less important than how we spend it, because values are more important than money. What we have been doing in the past is spending money on welfare in a way that has destroyed families and destroyed work. And so we have gotten not only not less poverty, but more poverty.