

What do these massive cuts for Medicare and Medicaid mean to rural Missouri, where I am from? It means loss, a huge loss in revenues for my hospitals. It means many of my senior citizens who are on a low income and Social Security will have to pay money they do not have in order to give tax cuts of \$20,000 for those who earn over \$250,000 a year. That is not right. That is not fair. That is mean-spirited.

We need rural hospitals in rural Missouri. We do not need them to be shut down because they want to give tax cuts to the wealthy. Mr. Speaker, think twice before you act.

HYPOCRISY ON ETHICS COMPLAINTS REGARDING BOOK ROYALTIES

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I listened yesterday with interest as the whining and moaning voices from the other side of the aisle criticized the Speaker of the House. What were they criticizing him for? He wrote a book. He was doing a book tour. Actually, he might get paid for that book. They acted like there was something unusual or unethical about what he was doing.

I would just ask, Mr. Speaker, where were those same voices in 1990, when Senator GORE received \$33,300 in book royalties? Where were they in 1991, when Senator GORE received \$66,700 in book royalties? Where were they in 1992, when Senator GORE took a 35-city book tour and received \$546,260 in book royalties? Where were they in 1993, when Vice President GORE received \$310.84 in book royalties?

There is a difference, however, Mr. Speaker. Senator GORE received a \$100,000 advance. Speaker GINGRICH received \$1. Stop the hypocrisy; it does not play well.

EXPRESSING PRIDE IN CAPTAIN O'GRADY AND HIS MARINE RESCUERS

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Americans awakened today to good news, the rescue of Capt. Scott O'Grady, the F-16 pilot whose plane was shot down last week by rebel Serbs over Bosnia. The successful mission was performed by the Marine Expeditionary Force, commanded by Col. Marty Berndt.

I share the pride in Captain O'Grady and the rescuing Marines that was so eloquently expressed earlier this morning by the President, our NATO Commander, Admiral Leighton Smith, and members of Captain O'Grady's family.

I had the pleasure, Mr. Speaker, of congratulating Colonel Berndt by telephone just a few moments ago. He was personally along on the rescue mission.

I have visited our troops participating in Operation Deny Flight, which includes an A-10 reserve wing from Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri.

All Americans should be grateful for the courage and for the dedication to this dangerous mission. We must also continue to support those who risk their lives every day in training and combat, in peace and war. All Americans, Mr. Speaker, are proud of Captain O'Grady, the rescuing marines, and all who wear the American uniform.

GOOD NEWS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on in the sentiment of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] who has so eloquently expressed our pride this morning in our military. Indeed, it is a great pleasure to wake up to good news in the midst of all the trouble that we are experiencing in the Bosnia area.

According to the morning news reports, and as has been confirmed now, the American pilot downed in Bosnia has been rescued by American marines, and is safe aboard a United States ship. I am sure every American's heart sings to hear that news. This was a very risky rescue mission. It was extremely dangerous. It was no easy thing to do.

It took a lot of courage and professionalism, but the professionalism, team spirit, and perseverance of our military personnel, coupled with the grace of God, saw those marines through, and helped bring our young pilot out of danger, back to his family, and back to our shores.

With the commemorations of Memorial Day still fresh in our minds, this feat of bravery reminds us again the risks and sacrifices our men and women in uniform take every day. We wish the pilot and his family well, and we thank all the families of those brave young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. They are always there when we need them. Thank God for them.

A SALUTE TO MARINE CAPT. SCOTT O'GRADY AND HIS RESCUERS

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to pay tribute to a remarkable act of courage that has taken place in the war-torn land of Bosnia.

I am talking about the rescue of Capt. Scott O'Grady, who had been missing for nearly a week, since his F-16 jet was shot down by the Bosnian Serbs.

Many had almost given up hope of Scott's return. But for 6 days, he survived on his own in the woods—and

stayed out of enemy hands—because of what one marine colonel called his “guts and his training.”

That is when an outstanding team of marines, led by Col. Martin Berndt, responded to his radio call, and braved fire from Serb forces to bring this American patriot back home.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words to express the gratitude of each and every American to Captain O'Grady, who placed his life on the line in the service of his country.

His valor, his perseverance, his cunning and skill in the toughest of circumstances are a tribute not just to the U.S. Marine Corps, but to America's fighting spirit itself.

As for his rescuers, I think it should be clear today that, as much as we need our weapons systems—as much as we need the sophisticated technology that keeps our troops safe and helps them do their jobs—the heart of our Armed Forces is the drive, the dedication, the determination of our men and women in uniform to do their best for America.

On behalf of every Member of this Congress, I salute them—I thank them—and I am grateful for the gift of Captain O'Grady's return to family and country.

PUT THE TAXPAYERS' INTERESTS FIRST: SUPPORT THE AMERICAN OVERSEAS INTERESTS ACT

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, today, the House will have an opportunity to vote for a foreign aid bill which, for the first time in nearly a half-century puts the interests of the American taxpayer first.

H.R. 1561 eliminates three major Government agencies and more than 20 low priority programs. It cuts \$3.7 billion from current spending over the next 2 years and it calls for savings of \$21 billion over the next 7 years.

The American Overseas Interests Act finally brings an end to the foreign policy status quo. It concentrates our limited resources on helping our friends to help themselves, it improves our global antiterrorism efforts and it strengthens our hand in the area of international narcotics control.

Mr. Speaker, Chairman GILMAN and the International Relations Committee have crafted a good bill—a bill which protects the interests of the American taxpayer and brings an end to the foreign aid status quo. I urge my colleagues to support the American Overseas Interests Act.

OVERSEAS INVESTMENT

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, when is a spending cut a spending cut?

Today, as we are considering the Overseas Interests Act that recognizes that we have won the cold war, we will answer that question.

The bill we are considering today reduces, diminishes, lessens, curtails, lowers and yes, cuts foreign aid. It concentrates on cutting aid to countries that do not support us in the United Nations. It punishes the countries that supply weapons to terrorist states. It refocuses our efforts on the countries that do support American interests overseas.

The new majority in this Congress are serious about cutting spending and eliminating agencies in this bill. We save the taxpayers \$21 billion over 7 years. That is a cut. We eliminate three major agencies in the first major restructuring of our foreign affairs operation in 50 years. That is a cut.

When is a spending cut a cut? It is today, when we debate and continue discussion on the Overseas Interests Act.

TWO WEEKS' DEBATE ON MONEY FOR FOREIGN AID, BUT NO FUNDING TO SOLVE AMERICAN PROBLEMS

(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, let us see if I can understand this. There are 25,000 murders a year. We have a Tax Code that is literally killing us. The IRS keeps ripping us off. We have parents without children, Social Security being raided, Medicare almost broke, a record number of school dropouts, workers losing their pensions, losing their health insurance benefits, workers losing their jobs, massive budget deficits, huge trade deficits, and, Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States has been debating foreign aid for 2 solid weeks.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Is it any wonder why America is so angry with their Government? While we debate foreign aid and more money for overseas, America is going to hell in a handbasket. Think about it.

CONCERN FOR THE REPUTATION OF THE HOUSE RAISED BY UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS ON SPEAKER'S BOOK DEAL

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

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today out of concern for the reputation of this institution. It is devastating when the Speaker of the House of Representatives does not stand by his words. NEWT GINGRICH announced earlier this year that he would not sign his book deal with Rupert Murdoch until the Ethics Committee had approved the contract. The jury is still out. And what has the Speaker done?

He has ignored the Ethics Committee and signed the contract anyway. Maybe the Speaker knows something that we do not know. Is it because every single Republican on the Ethics Committee has a conflict of interest in the Speaker's case? Is it likely that they cannot be credible as judge and jury?

Mr. Speaker, how can NEWT GINGRICH make such an outrageous claim, that if the Ethics Committee has not finished its deliberations, then he will assume that no rules have been broken. The Ethics Committee clearly said to the Speaker not to make such an absurd assumption. Once again, the Speaker has demonstrated that he will not allow the Rules or the Ethics Committee to stand in the way of his multi-million-dollar book deal. Is this the same person who led the call for an investigation of the former Speaker of the House, Jim Wright? I ask today, out of fairness to the American people, appoint an outside counsel. What's good for the goose is also good for the gander.

TIME FOR THE ETHICS COMMITTEE TO THROW OUT RIDICULOUS CHARGES

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

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman who spoke just before me brought up, because of an opportunity to respond to what the Ethics Committee is not willing to do. The fact of the matter is the Speaker did submit a contract for its review. The only role that the Ethics Committee has in this is to determine whether the contract is too generous. In fact, any Member can write a book in this House without having approval, but if the contract is too generous, such as Speaker Wright's, where he got 55 percent royalties, it becomes a gift.

The same contract that the Speaker submitted before two times and was approved in 3 weeks was submitted this time. It is not being approved by the Ethics Committee because the Democrats refuse to approve the very same contract that AL GORE got approved, that the gentleman from Michigan, DAVID BONIOR, got approved.

As a matter of fact, one of the ethics charges is that he used an 800 number on the floor of the House. So did 11 others. Do we discharge that complaint, or do we file complaints against the 11 others? One of the charges is that a cable channel carried his course. Every one of the Members plays on the cable channels for free. Do we level charges against each of them? It is time for the Ethics Committee to throw out these ridiculous, frivolous charges.

PRESIDENT CLINTON COMMENDED FOR VETOING RESCISSIONS BILL

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

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend President Clinton for his leadership in vetoing the mean-spirited rescission bill that passed this body. It is unbelievable that our President has to use his first veto on a bill to stand up for our children and our future. Investing in our children with programs like Goals 2000, Safe and Drug Free Schools, AmeriCorps, and School to Work Programs promote the betterment of our country.

Drastically reducing funds which go toward educating our children sends a bad signal to the rest of the world, telling them, we do not want to be competitive in the next century, we do not want to train our children to be the best that they can be, we do not want drug education in our schools. We need to stop this nonsense of cutting \$16 billion in domestic aid that affect our children at home and turning around to authorize \$16 billion for foreign aid for people abroad. Again, I commend President Clinton for vetoing this ill-advised rescissions bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE TAX SAVINGS BILL

(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, featuring interactive dialog with John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon, "Forrest Gump" proved that to star in a movie, one not only does not have to be an actor, but through modern technology, you do not have to be alive anymore, either.

Yesterday, by vetoing the \$16 billion tax savings bill, the Clinton administration proved a similar phenomenon: That is, even a dead presidency can continue to enhance its reputation as a big spending friend of bureaucracy long after its political life has expired. That is right. Without asking anybody, Mr. President just went ahead and vetoed.

For a short while, he will be the hero of the big spenders in Washington and the bureaucracy, but the American people will demand: If not these cuts, which cuts; if not this rescission, which rescission; if not these programs, which programs?

If you want relevancy, Mr. President, join the debate. Show us where you want to save the taxpayers' dollars.

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)