

Americans will plainly see the results of our crime bill as they feel safe again on their streets not locked fearfully in their homes forced to watch deceptive campaign commercials.

COMPACT-IMPACT AID

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, what do you get when you combine an unfunded mandate with unrestricted immigration? You get one messed up Federal policy.

Under the terms of the compacts between the United States and the former islands of the trust territory, the citizens of these newly independent countries can immigrate to the United States with absolutely no restrictions. To offset the expected costs of this immigration, the Federal Government also promised to reimburse the local governments for this impact.

Guam has incurred costs of \$70 million for this immigration, and Guam has received a whopping \$2.5 million in reimbursement. The Interior appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996 contains nothing for compact reimbursement.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to restore the compact-impact reimbursement of \$4.58 million requested for Guam. It is time for the Federal Government to pay up, and to end this ridiculous immigration policy.

THINK ABOUT THE BAD SITUATION OF THE JAPANESE ECONOMY BEFORE DRIVING THEM OVER THE CLIFF

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

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, it is come to this. We are down to the last few hours of what is a dangerous game of chicken with Japan. Tonight we will know whether we are going over the cliff or if one or both sides are going to blink in this dispute.

Well, everyone knows that Japan-bashing is popular. After all, the proposed sanctions are only going to hurt a few rich people who drive a car like Lexus, or did they ever think about Sam, who I met this last Friday at the Lexus dealership, who takes great pride in servicing those Lexuses and is very much a middle-class American?

It seems to me there is no game plan here; there is no end game. If we go all the way through with this, the economic and political ramifications for our relationship with Japan are going to be enormous. What happens if the other side retaliates? What will happen to Boeing and General Electric who are doing business in Japan today? Did the administration consider how little room the Japanese have to negotiate,

given the bad situation of their economy today?

Mr. Speaker, all we can do by driving them over the cliff is to harden their resolve and allow them to blame the United States for the problem. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for some responsible action in this area, to get Japan to do fundamental deregulation, not to get voluntary import quotas accepted by Japan. We need a different strategy.

HOW DO REPUBLICANS BALANCE THE BUDGET?

(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, tomorrow we begin another debate on the budget. The issue is how will we balance the budget? Who will be helped and who will be hurt?

The answer is now clear. The Republican majority wants to help only the richest 1 percent in this country, the millionaires, the billionaires. The Republican majority wants to help the military-industrial complex by buying more toys like the B-2 bomber that the Pentagon told us we did not even need.

Mr. Speaker, how do Republicans balance the budget? By giving the wealthiest a tax break and buying more toys for the Pentagon.

How do Republicans pay for this? By cutting the programs that will help out our seniors, our veterans, our students; by cutting Medicare, by cutting Medicaid, by cutting the veterans' programs, by cutting \$10 billion out of financial student assistance programs and by cutting social security.

The issue is, who will we help and who will we hurt? Will it be the millionaires and billionaires that will be helped? Will it be the seniors and the veterans and the students that will be hurt? I and the Democrats will stand with the seniors, the veterans and the students.

THE JEWISH HOSPITAL OF ST. LOUIS

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of the outstanding work of the Jewish Hospital of St. Louis. In conjunction with BJC Health System and Washington University School of Medicine, the hospital will be honored in a White House Ceremony today. It is being awarded a multiyear humanitarian grant to work with health care facilities in Riga, Latvia.

The St. Louis health professionals will be working with three hospitals including Riga's State Hospital for Children, as well as the maternity and local Jewish hospitals. Working to improve the quality and delivery of health care, the St. Louis mission will

lend its expertise to a community that needs guidance modernizing medical techniques and privatizing its healthcare system.

The staff of the Jewish Hospital of St. Louis is reaching across geographical, linguistic and ideological barriers to help those who need it most, the children and the infirm.

It is my pleasure to be able to express our gratitude for the work of the Jewish Hospital of St. Louis which has healed so many lives at home and will now heal many lives around the world.

REPUBLICANS BALANCING THE BUDGET ON THE BACKS OF OUR NATION'S SENIORS

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my outrage with the Republican proposal to balance the budget on the backs of our Nation's senior citizens. The Republican budget proposal would force our seniors to pay more than \$1,000 out of pocket each year while giving the very wealthiest 1 percent of Americans a windfall of \$20,000 a year in tax cuts.

It is outrageous that, at a time when our Nation's seniors are struggling more than ever to make ends meet, the Republicans have chosen to make it harder than ever for them to access quality health care. While it is important to work toward a balanced budget, we cannot force seniors to pick up the tab, while to add insult to injury, giving a tax break to the very wealthiest Americans. The Republicans claim that they must cut Medicare, because they project that the entire system will be out of money in 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues, "But even if you accept the Republican figures, and I don't, their Medicare cuts are 2½ times greater than called for to make their figures balance. The real purpose of this drastic cut in Medicare is to pay for a windfall for the very wealthy, not to save the future of Medicare for seniors."

Again I say, Mr. Speaker, "For shame."

WHO SAID WHAT ABOUT MEDICARE?

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the beauty of the well is that one can say anything that they want at any time, regardless of what the facts may be. Let us look at Medicare and who said what about Medicare.

The President's trustees, the President's trustees, three members of the President's Cabinet, have said that the Medicare Trust Fund will be broke, bankrupt, out of money—without anything—in 6 to 7 years. That is under

the median case scenario. It could be even shorter if things are worse.

What are the Republicans doing? What we are doing is we are spending right now in 1995 about \$400 per month per beneficiary on Medicare. That will go up in the year 2000 to about \$550 per month, per beneficiary. That is for one person over the age of 65 who is getting the benefits of Medicare.

I say to my colleagues, "Now you have really got to believe that that cup is completely half empty all of the time and that we must have Federal Government bureaucrats who are going to solve all these problems for us, if you don't believe that the private sector with \$550 month can deal with Medicare."

WOMEN MUST HAVE SAME HEALTH CARE RIGHTS AS MEN DO

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today, many of us are introducing a bill to protect women's health and the constitutional right to choose. It saddens me that this bill is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I am one of the few Members who was here when Roe versus Wade came down and we started finally getting politics out of doctors' offices and medical schools, and we said to politicians, "Really women need some advances in their health care, and they don't need political opinions. We would like medical opinions, the same kind men get."

Well, we made those terrific gains, and now we see the extremism coming back in this whole new primary era, and what is the battleground? The battleground once is women's health and trying to roll us back.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is saying we will not go back. It codifies the gains that we have, and we hope every Member who believes women should be full and equal citizens and have the same health care rights that men should have will join us in saying to the extreme right: "No, no, you don't play in women's health care. Keep your politics somewhere else."

We hope many of you will join us in this bill.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. SOLOMON. 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 under the 5-minute rule: The Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Science.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WISE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The Democrat leadership has been consulted, has not objections to these requests.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 79, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 173 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 173

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 79) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States. The joint resolution shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. The motion to recommit may include instructions only if offered by the minority leader or his designee. If including instructions, the motion to recommit shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, this rule provides a fair and reasonable way to consider the proposed constitutional amendment to allow Congress and the States to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States of America.

Let me go through the steps we will follow and Members in their offices should pay attention.

First there is the 1 hour of general debate on this rule that we are taking up right now, which is equally divided between the majority side and the mi-

nority side, half and half. After voting on the rule, there will then be an hour of general debate on the proposed constitutional amendment.

That time also is equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, who happen to be on different sides of the issue: again equal time, half and half. Then the rule allows for a motion to recommit which may include instructions if offered by the minority leader or his designee.

If the motion to recommit includes instructions, it may be debated for a full hour under the terms of this rule, not 10 minutes, a full hour. That hour would be controlled by a proponent and an opponent. That hour would be controlled by a proponent and an opponent. This would be the opportunity for the minority to offer an amendment or a substitute and have it voted on in the House.

For the record, I should note that in the full Committee on the Judiciary markup only one amendment was offered, only one, and we should remember that the proposed constitutional amendment before us is only one sentence. It is a simple concept.

The proposed amendment says, and I quote, "The Congress and the States shall have power to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States of America."

That is all the amendment does; it speaks to principle, not to detail.

Now, while short and simple, this proposed amendment to the Constitution carries great significance for me, and for many veterans, and for large numbers of patriotic citizens across this Nation. It is terribly, terribly important.

I want to express my special thanks to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANADY], who have really carried this in the Committee on the Judiciary. I thank the other Committee on the Judiciary members for all their work in moving this amendment to restore the Constitution to what it was, and that is exactly what we are doing, restoring it to what it was before the Supreme Court made what I consider to have been a very, very bad decision back in 1989.

As we begin this historic debate, I would like to provide some background on how we got to where we are now.

Prior to the Supreme Court decision in Texas versus Johnson back in 1989, 48 States, and one has to remember this, 48 States and the Federal Government had laws on the books prohibiting the desecration of that flag behind you, Mr. Speaker. In the Johnson case the Supreme Court held that the burning of an American flag as part of a political demonstration was expressive conduct protected by the first amendment to the Constitution.

In response to the Johnson decision, Congress passed the Flag Protection