

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

week ago there was a balanced budget when, in fact, it is not.

#### LEGAL SERVICES FOR THE POOR

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, very soon now, this House will be engaged in a great debate as to whether or not to preserve legal services to the poor as is now a part of the Federal establishment.

There is general agreement across the board from those who want to zero it out altogether and not spend one penny in the support of legal services from the Federal Government to those who would expand the legal services grouping, as we now know it; somewhere in the middle lies the final principle upon which this House will take action.

Do we want to provide legal services access to the courts for the poor? The answer is resoundingly probably, yes. But do we want to allocate Federal funds to a private corporation to dole out these sums to help the poor in the various States, or do we want to shrink the amount of money, send it to the States in the form of block grants and have them decide how to provide legal services for the poor?

These are the outlines for the debate that is yet to come.

#### IMPORTANT INFORMATION ABOUT SUDDEN INFANT DEATH SYNDROME [SIDS]

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, today, Representative TIM JOHNSON of South Dakota and I want to send a wake-up call to our colleagues about the No. 1 killer of infants during their first year of life: Sudden infant death syndrome, otherwise known as SIDS or crib death.

SIDS is defined as the "Sudden death of an infant under 1 year of age which remains unexplained after a thorough case investigation, including performance of a complete autopsy, examination of the death scene, and review of the clinical history."

The tragic and unexpected loss of a newborn is devastating to parents. What makes this disheartening experience even more agonizing is when doctors have no medical explanation for the infant's death.

SIDS is the leading cause of death among infants between the ages of 1 week and 1 year and strikes infants of all countries and cultures—in the United States alone, there are between 6,000 to 7,500 infants who unexpectedly die of SIDS each year.

As a new Member of the 104th Congress, I remain committed to increasing national public awareness about SIDS and educating parents about

steps they can take to reduce the risks of SIDS.

In 1994, a national "Back to Sleep" public education campaign was launched by Federal and private entities.

The goal of this campaign is to encourage parents to place healthy babies on their backs or sides to sleep which research has shown to reduce the risk of SIDS.

Representative JOHNSON and I have sent important information to each office about the "Back to Sleep" campaign and SIDS public service announcements. We encourage our colleagues to send this vital message about SIDS prevention home to your constituents.

#### WHAT A DIFFERENCE A REPUBLICAN MAJORITY MAKES

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the new Republican majority has decided to set an example for everyone else to follow. Today we are bringing to the floor our own funding bill, the legislative branch appropriations for fiscal year 1996. It may come as a shock to the American people, but, this year we are cutting our own budget by \$155 million. Yes, \$155 million.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority can make. We have worked hard to eliminate unnecessary programs, privatize programs, and to streamline this huge bureaucracy that we call our home away from home. We are going to make Congress work better with less money. In fact, if every other program in the Federal Government were being proportionately reduced, we would save more than \$130 billion during the next fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, what a difference a Republican majority makes.

□ 1020

#### EFFICIENCY, COST SAVINGS ARE HALLMARKS OF LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority continues to make good on our promise to change the status quo by cutting Government. Today we are bringing to the floor two measures to prove our dedication—the legislative branch appropriations bill, and legislation to establish a Corrections Day.

Through the legislative branch bill, we will reduce our own budget by \$155 million for the next fiscal year. We have cut congressional staff and eliminated unnecessary programs.

Corrections Day will help purge the Federal Government of ridiculous red tape. It will especially help State and

local officials, who have been dealing with ridiculous regulations for too long.

Mr. Speaker, a smaller, less costly, and more efficient Government is our goal.

#### EXTENSION OF AGREEMENT ON FISHERIES BETWEEN LATVIA AND THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104-86)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Resources and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), I transmit herewith an Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Latvia Extending the Agreement of April 8, 1993, Concerning Fisheries Off the Coasts of the United States. The Agreement, which was effected by an exchange of notes at Riga on March 28, 1995, and April 4, 1995, extends the 1993 Agreement to December 31, 1997.

In light of the importance of our fisheries relationship with the Republic of Latvia, I urge that the Congress give favorable consideration to this Agreement at an early date.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 20, 1995.

#### CUT CORPORATE WASTE

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

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, corporate welfare is defined as payment of Federal assistance in the form of subsidies, tax credits, and payments to business.

Such corporate welfare has grown to be so widespread that nearly every member of the Fortune 500 receives some sort of subsidy. Besides the enormous burden corporate waste places on the Federal budget, subsidies serve to weaken businesses; incentive to be competitive, efficient, and productive.

Reducing corporate subsidies is an important step in controlling spending. By sharply reducing these programs, we could eliminate unproductive programs while freeing much-needed funds for deficit reduction. In fact, cutbacks in corporate waste would have far more impact in reducing the deficit than many of the current efforts by Republicans to cut discretionary spending.

The Republicans have proposed to cut billions from programs that assist families, children, seniors, farmers, and veterans. Yet, while Republicans