

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 652. An act to provide for a pro-competitive de-regulatory national policy framework designed to accelerate rapidly private sector deployment of advanced telecommunications and information technologies and services to all Americans by opening all telecommunications markets to competition, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 219) "An act to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. NICKLES, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. GLENN, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. REID, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The chair will recognize each side for fifteen 1-minutes.

DIME STORE DEFICIT REDUCTION

(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, earlier this year some Members of Congress were infected with the me too but syndrome. As we discussed welfare reform they would say, "I'm for welfare reform, but" or when we passed a tough crime bill they said, "Me too, but, not that bill."

Now it appears a strain of that virus has infected the White House. President Clinton seems to have come down with me too not as much and I have no details syndrome.

The President told us last week that he was for spending cuts just not as much as Congress and he offered no specifics for his so-called budget plan. He claimed he was for tax cuts for hard working middle class Americans. But the House plan would allow families to keep too much of what they earn. And now we learn this week that the Clinton budget II, still leaves our children with huge annual deficits.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be fooled. As this House is trying to save the next generation from bankruptcy, the President is offering dime store deficit reduction.

STAND UP FOR WORKING PEOPLE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, the morning talk shows were having a great time, for they were talking about how the Congress was getting ready as a legislative body of the United States of America to do our own budget. As we address the appropriations for this Congress, there is a lot of smoke and mirrors, and I have come to stand on behalf of the working people.

What are we doing with this appropriation? We are cutting out jobs for working people, the folding room, hard-working citizens who have been working for many, many years, dedicated and loyal, providing mail service to this House—they will lose their jobs. The Printing Office, skilled craftsmen who have been working and contributing to this House, they, too, it seems will lose their jobs. And then the citizens who come to work here, they may be driving a 1967 Chevrolet, but they are coming to the Congress to work. What do we do? We cut out their parking lot just so a few extra dollars can go somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, if we are going to do real appropriating and let us be real fair, do not cut valuable services and real jobs for working Americans who work in lower level positions. Let us stand on the side of Americans who work, the citizens who come to work every day in the folding room, the Printing Office, and, yes, those individuals who drive far to come to work for the citizens of the United States of America who need just a simple unfancy parking lot to park in.

Smoke and mirrors, that is this appropriation. Vote "no" on this congressional budget appropriation process. There are no real cuts only smoke and mirrors—vote to save jobs.

PORKER OF THE WEEK AWARD

(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, last month 238 employees of the National Immunization Program held a conference at the luxurious Century Plaza Hotel in downtown Beverly Hills.

The event cost \$1,015,900.

This money could be used to immunize 13,500 babies. But I suppose a conference among bureaucrats in beautiful Beverly Hills was more important.

I am told the conference organizers selected Beverly Hills because of a recent outbreak of measles in Los Angeles. I wonder how many of the infected were in Beverly Hills at the time of the conference.

For whittling away taxpayer dollars so that bureaucrats can live high on the hog, the National Immunization Program gets my Porker of the Week Award.

SHAME, WASHINGTON POST

(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, the Washington Post bought eight brand-new printing presses, \$250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars. They got them from Mitsubishi of Japan, who they said was the low bidder over Rockwell International.

Beam me up. How many, Mr. Speaker, how many businesses in Japan buy ads in the Washington Post? How many Japanese read the Washington Post? How many Japanese buy the Washington Post?

Shame, Washington Post. Hide your face, and while you are hiding your face, on behalf of all the workers at Rockwell International who are not allowed to bid in Japanese markets, shove your printing presses up your low bid.

CONGRATULATING THE HOUSE ON CORRECTIONS DAY

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to take a minute to congratulate the House. Later on today we will pass the provision in the rules which creates Corrections Day. Later, after that, we will establish the bipartisan committee or task force which will be reviewing proposals for Corrections Day. Later, after that, we will establish the bipartisan committee or task force which will be reviewing proposals for Corrections Day.

This is an idea which first developed earlier this year, and people said, "Isn't there some way to correct the bureaucracy when it is doing things that make no sense?" I think it is a sign of real progress that on a bipartisan basis we were able to work out both the arrangement to establish a procedure for Corrections Day and we were able to establish, with the minority leader, a proposal and a list of names so there will be genuine bipartisanship in pursuing this, I think it is an example of working together.

We can get something good done for the American people, and we can cut some of the nonsense out of the Federal Government.

So I commend the Committee on Rules for its diligence, and I commend the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH] and the others who worked so hard to make this come true.

WHAT WE ARE NOT DOING TODAY

(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 think that it is important, after just hearing from

Speaker GINGRICH, what we are going to do and what we are not going to do today.

Well, I will have to ask the empty Chamber what we are not going to do today.

What we are not going to do today is deal with the question of billionaires and the tax loopholes they can take in renouncing their citizenship. What we are not going to do today is to add a gift ban, a meaningful gift ban, which many of us have taken voluntarily, that requires, that allows, that makes sure that we do not fall under undue influence.

What is important to ask today is not what we are doing with some of these poll-driven, cynical ideas that seem to reach out to the common denominator, but, rather what we are not doing up here. We are not taking care of Medicare. We are cutting Medicare to give a tax break to the most wealthy.

We have got to look not at what we are doing today but what we are not doing, and what they are planning to do.

WE WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, we will balance the budget. This will not be easy, but we will balance the budget, but not quite as soon as we would like, but we are going to do it.

How will we do this? We are going to have to rein in the spending, and we will rein in the spending.

The way that we should look at each expenditure, as this budget comes before us, look at each expenditure in this way: Is this spending so important that we are willing to borrow the money to do it? We do not have the money. We have debt now. We do not have the money. Borrow the money to do it and force our children and grandchildren to pay interest on it for the rest of their lives, to lower their standard of living to pay interest on that money for the rest of their lives? If it is that important, then we should spend the money, and if it is not, we should delete it.

BAN GIFTS FROM LOBBYISTS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the American public strongly favors banning gifts from lobbyists to Members of Congress, yet, again and again, the Republican leadership has turned back Democratic efforts to pass gift ban legislation. Yesterday, yet another Democratic gift ban amendment ran up against yet another Republican stone-wall.

The Baldacci amendment to the legislative appropriations bill we will con-

sider today would have prohibited legislative funds from going to any Member or employee who has accepted a gift from a paid lobbyist, a lobbying firm, or an agent of a foreign principal. Yet, the Republican leadership will not even allow this amendment to come to the floor for a vote.

Perks and privileges demean this institution and everyone who serves here. We are here to do the people's business and we are well compensated for that. We do not need paid vacations, frequent flier miles, or free meals to sweeten the deal. It is high time Republicans live up to their rhetoric on reform and join Democrats to clean up Congress and ban gifts from lobbyists.

PEOPLE OF AMERICA KNOW HOW TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget is serious and difficult business. This was made even plainer this week when it was made known by the Congressional Budget Office that the President's plan to balance the budget in 10 years, which, by the way, is far longer than most Americans want to take to balance the budget, that his plan is out of balance by roughly \$200 billion a year and is still out of balance at the end of 10 years by, I think, \$209 billion.

Now, I am sure that the President and all of his people worked very hard on this plan to balance the budget, and the fact that it is out of balance every year roughly \$200 billion and still out of balance in year 10, over \$200 billion, indicates how difficult balancing the budget is.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you where the real wisdom is in how to balance the budget, and that is outside the beltway. Let us go out to real America where people work and earn a living and balance their budget day in and day out, year in and year out. They will have the answer of how to do it here.

IN SUPPORT OF NIH FUNDING

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans want to balance the budget, provide tax cuts for the wealthy, and increase defense spending at the expense of vital programs that serve the health of every American.

In their budget plan, they have proposed a \$2.8 billion cut in funding for the National Institutes of Health, the world's leading biomedical research institution.

Their plan would jeopardize our Nation's health and our economy.

It would limit medical advances for life-threatening diseases such as heart disease and cystic fibrosis.

It would reduce the number of new technologies and treatments which save billions in annual medical care costs.

It would also threaten America's status as the premier health research center of the world and the 726,000 jobs this industry has created.

A cut of this magnitude is not only wrong, it lacks public support. Over 91 percent of Americans want us to spend more, not less, on health research.

M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, located in my district, is one of the best cancer research facilities in the world. The cancer center was among the first institutions to conduct trials of the new anticancer drug taxol, now being used to treat over a dozen types of cancer. NIH provided the resources to help M.D. Anderson develop this drug.

I do not believe the American people want us to reduce experiments which could provide a breakthrough in the treatment or cure for breast cancer, Hodgkin's disease, or melanoma.

If NIH's budget is reduced, M.D. Anderson and other institutions across the Nation would face even tighter budgets. These facilities would be forced to eliminate thousands of research-associated jobs.

Let us not risk America's role in biomedical research. If we do, our Nation could face a serious health care crisis down the road.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET OUT OF BALANCE

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, a week ago the President of the United States spoke to the American people and entered, reentered the debate. He had sort of been AWOL for several months about the budget, and he reentered the debate, came in from the cold and said that he was presenting us with a balanced budget, or a budget that would be in balance after 10 years.

Republicans, while wishing that he had probably been there a lot sooner, generally welcomed him and asked him to be a part of it and looked forward to that and felt good about that, felt good he was going to enter back into the fray.

We have now found out from the CBO that, in fact, this budget that was presented is not in balance at all. In fact, it shows \$200 billion deficits through the 5th year, through the 6th year, through the 7th year, through the 10th year. Every single year, it goes from \$191 billion to about \$210 billion.

It reminds me a great deal of the same situation we had in 1992, where the President campaigned from the center and then, after he was elected, governed from the left. Here we have a situation where the claim was made a