

votes on Thursday. If everything goes well, we are hopeful we will be able to make a 3 o'clock departure time on Thursday.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Again, the intent is not to have votes on Friday? That is the clear intent?

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GEPHARDT. A further question, can the gentleman give any advice to Members on whether other days will be given away prior to the April recess? In particular, I am thinking of Monday, April 3, or Friday, April 7. Does the gentleman have any advice on that at this point?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, at this point I can only tell the gentleman with respect to both of those days I have only high hopes, but no clear enough picture to be able to advise you.

Mr. GEPHARDT. And then, fourth, regarding the rule on the tax bill which is coming in the last week, it is my understanding that the Committee on Rules will meet on the tax bill on Wednesday. I would like to ask if it is true that just one substitute may be made in order; will Members on both sides of the aisle be permitted to offer substitutes for that bill?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, we have made no decisions regarding that. I think that it is true that the committee will meet on that and, I believe, start taking testimony on Wednesday, if that is correct, 10 o'clock in the morning next week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Ten o'clock on Wednesday. So Members who want to offer substitutes or amendments should be willing to appear on Wednesday morning?

Finally, I would like to ask about the timing on the budget resolution. As the gentleman knows, it is traditional under our rules to have completed a budget resolution by the middle of April. I am told that you intend to start in the first part of May, and I just am wondering when you are thinking of trying to bring a budget to the floor.

Can the distinguished majority leader give me a sense of when we might get to the floor on the budget?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, of course, as the gentleman knows, in many, many instances in the past several years it has been impossible to make that exact deadline, and we certainly intended to move on a budget bill as soon after our reconvening after the April work period as possible. So I would say as early in May as we can get our work done we will be announcing that to the floor.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO], the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SABO. I am curious as it relates to the tax bill, what other bills will be combined with that? I am thinking particularly of the bill we voted out of the Committee on the Budget and other bills that have come out of En-

ergy and Commerce and other committees, the additional changes in Medicare out of Ways and Means. Are those all going to be combined in one bill?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, I can only tell you that the Committee on Rules will be meeting on Wednesday. They will be taking testimony on Wednesday, and we will begin to see what form that takes as that proceeds.

Mr. SABO. So we do not know yet what the exact form of the legislation of the final week before the recess will be, whether it is one bill or several bills?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, that is correct.

Mr. SABO. If the minority leader will yield further, I would only indicate to the House that in recent years the House has completed its action on budget resolutions well in advance of April 15.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I just have one additional last question. Does the gentleman expect us to go to conference on the line-item veto bill next week?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield, as the gentleman knows, conference reports may be brought up at any time. We would certainly want to move as quickly as we can on that, and having the Senate's action only just last night, we will get to it as soon as we can. I cannot make an announcement at this time.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, MARCH 24, 1995, TO TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 28, 1995, for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

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 gentle-

woman from Washington [Mrs. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. JEFFERSON 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 Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER 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 Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MILITARY TRAINING AND READINESS

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the last Congress when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were in the majority, many of us testified that the extension of Somalia was, first of all, going to cost American lives; second, that it was going to cost billions and billions of dollars, and at the same time it was going to eliminate readiness, because the amount of training that our military was able to do during the extension of Somalia in peacekeeping would be diminished.

We also recognized that a policy change from humanitarian to go after General Aideed would be disastrous, and during that time those decisions

were made and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in a partisan-ship vote, passed the extension of Somalia.

We take a look at us going into Haiti. It is costing us billions and billions of dollars in nation building.

We look at the money we have given to the former Soviet Union, Russia. We gave Russia over a billion dollars to dismantle nuclear weapons. We gave them billions of dollars in nation building.

But last year they built and are steaming five nuclear class Typhoon submarines and three other submarines that are developed just to tap into our communications cables in the Atlantic and the Pacific. They are building MiG-35's, which are superior to our F-14 and F-15. They are building AA-10 missiles, which are superior to our AMRAAM, but yet, many say the cold war is over.

And we look at the billions of dollars we are spending in Bosnia and across the, the Members on the other side of the aisle, they are decrying we are cutting, we are cutting, we need to apply the money to the deficit. Well, I say, Mr. Speaker, we would have billions of dollars to apply to the deficit and we would also not have a military with its readiness and national security forces so low.

I sit on the former Committee on Armed Services which is now called the Committee on National Security, and we have had the Joint Chiefs testify that we are on the razor's edge, or another term was buffet, which means the position just before you stall an airplane, on our national security.

□ 1415

And just a minute ago, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] objected to a motion that would allow us to bring an appropriations bill forward to help the readiness. Our men and women, many agree, need better equipment, less troops and high technology. But we must help and support the appropriations bill on Tuesday.

We would have hoped that we could have filed it today because we are risking the men and women's lives.

Kara Hultgreen, a young lady, highly trained and motivated, and the first F-14 driver in the U.S. Navy, she came around the corner just a few weeks ago on an F-14 aboard the U.S.S. *Abraham Lincoln*. She had an engine failure.

On our side of the aisle. Republicans tried to get additional money to replace those engines because the compressor stalls. But many of the liberals on that side said, "Let's cut defense." They cut it \$177 billion. What we are seeing—we lost five Navy airplanes in the last 2 months, the Air Force has lost four to faulty parts and engines and poor training. I would say, Mr. Speaker, if we really care about our men and women that we expect to fight and, in some cases, die for this country, that we need to support them.

I beg Members from the other side of the aisle to consider, take a look at what we have done in the past. We need to stay out of countries like Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda, and Bosnia. Let us support things back home.

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

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

THE MOST IMPORTANT WEEK OF THE 104TH CONGRESS: WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JONES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I said 2 nights ago that this was the most important week of the 104th Congress. This week we decided between two very different visions of America. The first vision is offered by the same people who stood guard over 30 years of disintegrating families, children having children, burned out cities, a 30-percent illegitimacy rate, and three generations of Americans who do nothing but sit at home waiting for the next government check to arrive.

The Democrats are the guardians of business as usual; more taxes, more bureaucrats, more Washington. Having lost faith in the American dream, they have nothing to offer except more of the same shopworn programs which degrade and enslave millions. They have made generations of Americans nothing more than animals in the Government barn. They promise you happiness in exchange for a handout and the loss of your freedom. Their notion of reform is to spend more of other peoples' money.

Take a look at their so-called answers to our Personal Responsibility Act. One raises taxes on every business—big and small—in America and the other cuts off child tax credits for almost half of the families in this country. Each Democratic welfare bill says the Government must give you a job and if the State doesn't have any jobs to give it will pay someone in the private sector to hire you.

This is what the liberals have in store for us. This is their version of reform: have a child out of wedlock, don't have a job and don't live with a man who is working. If you do these things the taxpayer will provide you with everything you need. Uncle Sam will give you a check each month, with free medical care, free food, and under Mr. Clinton's plan, a Federal job and free child care.

Mr. Speaker, I really feel sorry for the Democrats. They actually believe it is an act of kindness to hand able-bodied Americans womb to tomb care, demanding nothing in return. They call

this \$5 trillion nightmare that they have created—a system which dooms millions to a life of poverty and condemns helpless children to perpetual despair—compassionate. Their system is not compassionate, their system is obscene.

The ugly sideshow of the liberal's welfare system is the notorious child welfare bureaucracy. The massive increase in illegitimacy that the liberals want to subsidize has created a horrendous explosion in the number of abused and neglected children. As Mona Charen noted yesterday, "social services and charities are overburdened by the caseload but they are also overburdened by liberal thinking." Clinton Democrats are formally committed to a philosophy and practice which in most cases sends an abused and neglected child back to the parents who have hurt him, all in the name of family preservation. The Republican welfare reform bill recognizes this nonsense for the folly that it is. We believe that it is a far greater kindness to place a child with loving adoptive parents rather than to give an abusive violent parent another dozen chances to hurt that child.

Before I came to Washington, I watched the liberal Democrats and their allies in the permanent poverty industry heap scorn upon anyone who dared stand up and say that welfare socialism was destroying our country from within. But on November 8, 1994 we the people finally rose up and said enough is enough. We had enough of the professionally compassionate robbing us of our hard-earned money, dumbing down our schools, promoting deviant behavior and creating a suffocating culture of dependency for our poorest families. They had 30 years to do something about welfare and they sat on their hands and did nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I said at the beginning of my remarks that we are debating two visions of America. We know where the liberal vision has taken us. The second vision—the conservative vision—begins and ends with individual liberty. Our view of society is one in which people have the right and the opportunity to work, invest, and raise their children as they see fit. We have faith in the energy of the American people, the liberals have faith in Washington, DC.

The Republican reform bill takes aim at the heart of the welfare problem—the underage mother who enters the welfare rolls after conceiving an out-of-wedlock child. Our reform denies benefits to those who continue to have children without having any means to independently support those children. We also eliminate the Federal middleman and cut the heart out of the Washington welfare bureaucracy.

We send power back to the people. We say the real welfare reformers are in the States and counties. These are the people closest to the problem. They know their communities' needs. They