

United States for the plan he put forth last night to balance the Federal budget by the year 2005. I further commend him for proposing that our health care and education programs be protected for the long-term strength of this Nation.

We now, for the first time in a very long time, have the House and the Senate and the President working toward the important goal of balancing our Federal budget.

We are proud that we have reduced our deficit for each of the last 3 years, the first time since Harry Truman was President that we have been able to say that. And now let the debate begin about how we can continue to stay on this path to a balanced budget.

WHAT ARE THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET SPECIFICS?

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, the freshmen Republicans sent President Clinton a letter 1 month ago encouraging him to submit a balanced budget. Up until now President Clinton had sided with his pollsters and spin-masters and made a conscious decision not to submit a balanced budget. Welcome to the arena, Mr. President. We hope your decision is a permanent one and that you do not change your mind and fall back when the going gets tough.

But if you noticed, the President was not very specific about how to accomplish his stated goal. Where are the details, Mr. President? Where are the specifics on how to achieve your balanced budget?

Republicans accepted Mr. Clinton's challenge back in January to be specific about our plan. Mr. President, give us your specifics. I will be glad to make copies and distribute them to the rest of my colleagues.

JOIN WITH THE PRESIDENT TO SOLVE THE BUDGET PROBLEM

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning in strong support of what President Clinton is beginning to work on with the Congress.

I heard just as President Clinton heard on Sunday, and I think that the American people can be confident that we all get the message. The message is, we need to work together. We need to come together to find a way to deal with our long-term deficit problem.

Now, for people to argue that 7 or 10 years is a big difference, I think misses the point. The point is, we need to decide how we can do it without providing a huge tax break for the most wealthy, without slashing the programs that help those in our society who need help, but with a glidepath to

a balanced budget. If it is in 10 years, that is fine. That is what we need to do. But we need to do it together, and I reach out to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Please, join with the President, try to find a constructive solution to this problem.

FLAG BURNING

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

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, this Wednesday is Flag Day.

Throughout the Nation, Americans will unfurl the Stars and Stripes, flying our flag proudly as citizens of the greatest Nation on Earth.

Our flag reminds us of our heritage. It reminds us of everything that is good about this Nation, and it reminds us of all those who have served America in the Armed Forces who make it all possible.

Our flag is more than just a piece of cloth. It embodies us as a nation—our values and our beliefs. And especially, the memories of all those who gave their lives to make the United States of America the great country it is today.

That is why we cannot tolerate any deliberate desecration of the American flag.

I for one look forward to June 28 when we will vote on a constitutional amendment banning flag desecration. I will be proud to cast my vote for that amendment because I believe our flag is part of the very fabric of America, and the symbol that our veterans fought for and died for and deserves this protection.

MARRIAGE PENALTY

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, the American Heritage Dictionary defines the word "simplify" as "to render less complex." When it comes to the marriage penalty provision in the Tax Code, the Republican contract defines "simplify" as 20 additional pages of tax tables and more confusion and headaches.

Do not get me wrong—I oppose the marriage penalty and have tried for years to reduce it. The Republicans tried to make it better—and I applauded them for the effort. But the results do not live up to the promise.

I have with me an analysis from the Treasury Department that says the Republican contract's marriage penalty provision is an administrative nightmare. It would add dozens of pages of tax tables, all for very little benefit to the taxpayer. Treasury also estimated that taxpayers with interest from savings accounts or who itemize deductions would have to do four sets of calculations under the new marriage penalty provision. That is the exact opposite of tax simplification.

I urge my colleagues to rethink this provision. Anything worth doing is worth doing right. And things should not get more complex when we try to simplify.

PUBLIC BROADCASTING

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, like millions of Americans, I am a supporter of the Public Broadcasting System. And, like millions of Americans, I am also a supporter of reducing the size of government and balancing our budget. Preserving PBS and balancing the budget are worthy, and not totally inconsistent, goals. I have come to the conclusion that we can do both.

At first glance, some might suggest that my conclusion is far fetched. After all, Federal dollars are becoming harder and harder to come by. The priorities are many and the dollars are few. But I believe we are overlooking a tremendous opportunity for both Congress and public broadcasting. It is called the free marketplace.

In this age of exploding technology and the revolution in the telecommunications industry, the marketplace is where the action—and the future—is. Public broadcasting's greatest asset—its educational mission—is a marketing dream and provides an attractive incentive for investment.

Interest remains high in the marketplace—and in living rooms across America—for quality programming. I believe innovative public-private partnerships hold the key, providing public broadcasting the opportunity to seek ways of lessening its dependence on Federal dollars while exploring a long-term funding strategy.

It is time for a bold, imaginative, and decisive action plan to guide the future of public broadcasting. That course can best be determined by joining together the leadership of Congress, public broadcasting, and the business community. Acting together, we can secure long term viability. But we must act now. Time is running out.

Rather than pointing fingers, Republicans and Democrats should join together in building a bridge between business and public broadcasting. Short of a private/public partnership, partisan politics will prevail. Lacking a truly bipartisan solution, Congress will lose more than Big Bird and the Civil War. We will lose the trust of the American people who look to us for leadership and creative solutions to guide the future of this treasured national resource.

SUPREME COURT DECISION TURNS BACK THE CLOCK

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

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my displeasure over

the Supreme Court ruling on affirmative action programs. These programs have been in place to assist struggling minority and women-owned businesses all over the country, people who have been denied opportunities in the past by law and who are still being denied opportunities in fact. They have been denied the opportunities to participate in this great country. We must not let the Republican angry-white-male syndrome keep others from full participation in the American dream.

We must continue to reach out to the disadvantaged, not only to blacks, but to women and also to those who have physical disabilities.

The current Supreme Court decision has turned back the clock of time. We must reverse this in order to continue the few decades of progress this country has made in the area of diversity, equality, and justice for all.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation cannot afford to go back down the road to discrimination.

WHAT ARE DETAILS OF PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PLANS?

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

Mr. CHRYSLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome Mr. Clinton to the balanced budget battle. You know, we are looking forward to the details of his plans. All we know at this time is that 90 percent of its cuts, \$190 billion, occur in the last year of its 10-year plan. The freshmen sent a letter to the leadership and said that we would not vote for any budget that did not put this country on the glidepath to a balanced budget by the year 2002. The leadership then sent a letter to the President and asked him if he would give us his vision, where he would like the money spent, and give us a budget that would balance. We asked for that to be done before he went to Russia, and in fact we received only the budget that gave us \$200 billion deficits for as far as the eye could see.

Well I guess at this point he has wet his finger and seen which way the political winds are blowing, and can we really take him seriously when in fact it was him and his people that worked in the Senate to kill the balanced budget amendment by getting six Democrats that had always voted for a balanced budget in the Senate to vote against the balanced budget amendment.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET EFFORTS ARE LATE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, this morning the silence is deafening. Only 2 members of the new minority, with over 200 members in their ranks, only 2

members of the new minority stood here in the well of the House to champion the President's effort to balance the budget. Let me again repeat what the ranking Democrat on the House Committee on Appropriations told both the Associated Press and ABC News:

I think most of us learned some time ago that if you don't like the President's position on a particular issue, you simply need to wait a few weeks . . . If you can follow this White House on the budget, you're a whole lot smarter than I am.

So spoke the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. Small wonder then that I refer to my friends on this side of the aisle as guardians of the old order. We welcome the President's efforts, but as our own leadership said, this train left the station, and he is making a vain attempt now to latch on to the caboose.

PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule.

Committee on Agriculture; 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 Resources; Committee on Science; and Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. McNULTY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is correct, the minority has been consulted. There is no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

MODIFICATION TO DELLUMS AMENDMENT NUMBER 2 TO H.R. 1530, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1530, pursuant to House Resolution 164, my amendment at the desk which corrects a drafting error be substituted for and considered in lieu of my amendment No. 2 now printed in subpart D of part 1 of House Report 104-136.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to amendment number 2 in subpart D of part 1 of House Report 104-136 offered by Mr. DELLUMS:

Page 38, line 18, insert "(a) IN GENERAL.—" before "Of the amounts".

Page 38, after line 22, insert the following:

(b) REDUCTION.—The amounts provided in subsection (a) and in section 201(4) are each hereby reduced by \$628,000,000.

(c) NATIONAL MISSILE DEFENSE AMOUNT.—Of the amount provided in subsection (a) (as reduced by subsection (b)), \$371,000,000 is for the National Missile Defense program.

At the end of title IV (page 161, after line 3), insert the following new section:

SEC. 433. ADDITIONAL MILITARY PERSONNEL AUTHORIZATION.

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense for fiscal year 1996 for military personnel the sum of \$628,000,000. Of the amount appropriated pursuant to such authorization—

(1) \$150,000,000 (or the full amount appropriated, whichever is less) shall be for increased payments for the Variable Housing Allowance program under section 403a of title 37, United States Code, by reason of the amendments made by section 604; and

(2) any remaining amount shall be allocated, in such manner as the Secretary of Defense prescribes, for payments for the Variable Housing Allowance, the Basic Allowance for Quarters, and the Basic Allowance for Subsistence in such a manner as to minimize the need for enlisted personnel to apply for food stamps.

Page 280, beginning on line 19, strike out "beginning after June 30, 1996" and inserting in lieu thereof "after September 1995".

Mr. DELLUMS (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the modification be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XXIII the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1530.

□ 1035

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

The CHAIRMAN. Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, with Mr. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Tuesday, June 13, 1995, the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] had been disposed of.