

keep the services that we need for people to improve the quality of their life and the opportunities to get a job and to raise their families and to have the pride of work, but we are trying to eliminate the bureaucracies that we have in Washington, and we are doing that successfully every day.

This bill that we just passed tonight cuts a total of 16.5 billion from funding levels by eliminating unauthorized programs, duplicative programs and eliminates bureaucracies that are wasteful.

Other reforms I think this Congress can be proud of here at the 6-month point for the 104th Congress include legislation that calls for a gift ban from lobbyists, a reduction of the pensions, which has been adopted, for Members, a reduction by one-third of our committee staffs, eliminating 3 committees and 25 subcommittees, legislation calling for a sunset of Federal regulations and of Federal agencies that have become wasteful and are duplicating what has been done in the states.

All of this has created \$165 million of savings just from the House of Representatives alone. Overall in our government, 190 billion in spending reductions and 90 billion in deficit reduction.

One more area of reform which I think is important to announce today, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, of which I am a Member, under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman BILL CLINGER, and the Regulatory Subcommittee under the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman DAVE MCINTOSH, we began hearings today in another important area of new reform; that is, to investigate the issue of nonprofit organizations which receive federal funds from taxpayers and make use of those funds to support political activity or to support a political point of view. People in the United States should not have their taxes used for that purpose. That is for private purposes, not for the public. President Thomas Jefferson long ago criticized such activities as not in keeping with the will of the people.

The U.S. court cases reinforce this position. Just this week, Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal outlined in an article that there may be as many as 40,000 nonprofit organizations that receive partial funding from the Federal Government that may be involved in activities which are inappropriate in the sense that they are doing political activity for one point of view, and this is inappropriate.

We received excellent testimony from the United Seniors Association, through its spokesperson Jim Martin. He explained that not \$1 of his organization goes to help represent seniors or the people that are involved with the group.

We also received excellent testimony from ALAN SIMPSON, the U.S. Senator, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], and Mrs. Spare from the Asso-

ciation for Retarded Citizens in Pennsylvania.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to continuing those hearings and to be able to come back to this House with meaningful legislation that will make sure that the people's business is being taken care of, less waste, more services for the people, and more for what the American people want and that is an accountable government.

EFFECT OF BUDGET CUTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words tonight about the budget passed today and also the rescission package and to suggest that it is terribly important that the American people have an understanding of what is going on, because to a very significant degree, the budget proposal passed by the Republican leadership today is going to balance the budget on the backs of the most vulnerable people in our country and give tax breaks and subsidies to precisely those people who need it the least.

Mr. Speaker, in my State of Vermont, we have thousands and thousands of senior citizens who tonight are finding it difficult to pay for their prescription drugs. Today they cannot afford the high cost of health care. It is grossly unfair to make those senior citizens and senior citizens all over this country pay more for Medicare because of the devastating cuts that are contained within the Republican budget passed today.

Second of all, in Vermont and all over this country, middle-class parents are wondering how they are going to afford to send their kids to college, given the escalating cost of higher education. Everybody knows that in the competitive world economy, our young people need the best education that they can get. Within that context, it is absolutely insane to be cutting back on student loans and student grants. We need more help for middle-class and working-class families to help them send their kids to college, not less help.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so often on the floor of this House, this is the 50th anniversary of World War II. And over and over again we hear people talking about the heroism, the bravery, the courage of the men and women in this country who defeated Hitler and saved human civilization in their terrible struggle against Nazism and Fascism 50 years ago. And we thank those veterans.

In my State of Vermont, many of them, many of them have been wounded in various wars in body and in spirit. This country owes a great deal to those men and women.

I wonder how many of them know that after all of the praise that is heaped upon them that in reality and real life, after all of the talk and all of

the rhetoric, that the Republican budget makes tens of billions of dollars in cuts in veterans' programs. So thank you very much, those veterans who tonight are in the VA hospitals. Thank you for the work and the courage that you gave this country 50 years ago and our thank you is that we cut the benefits and the programs that were promised to you.

A couple of weeks ago I received a letter from a veteran from Rutland, VT, and he said, let us talk about the Contract With America. And he talked about how his arm was wounded fighting against the Japanese during World War II. And he said, I know what the Contract With America is about, because he and millions of other Americans made a real Contract With America when they spilt their blood defending this country. And today it is no way to say thank you to those men and women by cutting programs.

Mr. Speaker, I think almost everybody in this House, the Republicans, the Democrats and me, the only Independent in this Congress, understand that the deficit and the \$4.7 trillion national debt is a very serious problem that must be dealt with. Almost everybody wants to move us toward ending our deficit, balancing the budget.

The question is, how do you do it? do you cut back on Head Start? Do you cut back on WIC? do you cut back on environmental programs on library programs? Or do you finally have the courage to say, let us move forward in a fair way.

Mr. Speaker, a recent economic study came out printed on the front page of the New York Times. The richest 1 percent of the population owns 40 percent of the wealth of America; richest 1 percent owns more than the bottom 90 percent. Yet this proposal, budget proposal of the Republicans does what? Half of the tax breaks, individual tax breaks go to people earning \$100,000 a year. Rich get richer; poor get poorer. We give tax breaks to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, we must move forward toward a balanced budget. But let us not do it on the backs of the weakest and the most vulnerable people. Let us ask those people who have the money, among many other things, to pay their fair share of taxes. Let us deal with the scandal of corporate welfare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise to cosponsor a resolution introduced by Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa, opposing the resumption of French nuclear tests in the South Pacific.

On June 13, 1995, French President Jacques Chirac announced that he would end his nation's moratorium on nuclear tests and conduct eight underground nuclear tests on Moruroa Atoll in French Polynesia between September 1995 and May 1996. According to President Chirac, the tests are to ensure the reliability and security of France's nuclear arsenal and perfect laboratory simulation so that

further tests will be unnecessary. I respectfully suggest to President Chirac that the eight underground nuclear tests to be conducted between September and May are themselves unnecessary.

The threat of nuclear war that once cast a large shadow over national and international affairs has been considerably diminished since the end of the cold war. One hundred and seventy nations agreed recently to extend the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the expectation that the nuclear powers, including France, would ratify a comprehensive nuclear test ban by 1996 and refrain from conducting any nuclear test. France's planned nuclear tests conflict with the designation of the South Pacific as a nuclear-free zone. In spite of these developments and designations, President Chirac has decided that France will become one of only two nations—the other being China—still conducting nuclear tests.

In announcing the resumption of French nuclear tests, President Chirac waved away the criticism of ecologists by stating that the eight planned underground tests on Moruroa Atoll would have "no ecological consequences." President Chirac also indicated his decision was "in the higher interest of [the French] nation" and also "irrevocable." While President Chirac's decision appears intended to reinforce France's stature as the world's third nuclear power, it also revives the dismissive attitude of past French Governments toward the concerns of scientists and South Pacific Islanders.

As our colleague Congressman FALCONE has noted, South Pacific Islanders are acutely aware of the lingering effects of nuclear testing. Certainly, the Marshall Islanders who were exposed to radiation when the United States Government conducted nuclear weapons tests over Bikini Atoll in the 1940's and 1950's could tell President Chirac a thing or two about the consequences, ecological and otherwise, of nuclear tests.

Nuclear tests release two types of radioactive isotopes. The first type, radioactive iodine, is relatively short-lived and decays rapidly within several months. The second type, including cesium-137, strontium-90, and plutonium-239, is very long-lived, and if present in the food chain, even in low-levels, could be responsible for producing increased risks of cancers of all types. The fact that an excessive number of thyroid nodules and birth defects have been observed among residents of the northern Marshall Islands suggests strongly that long-lived radioactive isotopes are present in the environment of the northern Marshall Islands.

Of course, President Chirac could—and probably would—dismiss these observations about the lingering effects of nuclear tests on Marshall Islanders on the grounds that the 66 nuclear tests conducted by America during the 1940's to 1950's took place in the atmosphere whereas the eight nuclear tests that France plans to conduct will take place deep under Moruroa Atoll.

President Chirac has made it abundantly clear that he is both determined to resume French nuclear tests and confident that the planned series of underground nuclear tests pose absolutely no risk to the ocean, the marine life, and surrounding environment.

I must respectfully point out to President Chirac that his decision to resume nuclear tests under Moruroa Atoll is appalling to envi-

ronmentalists, scientists, nuclear disarmament supporters, and the people who live in or around the South Pacific. I strongly and earnestly appeal to President Chirac to rescind his decision to resume these French nuclear tests. They constitute a needless assault on our ocean habitat as well as an open violation of the test ban treaty.

The world should not have to tolerate any more tests. The Just-One-More-Test-Before-We-Sign-the-Treaty stance taken by President Chirac is sheer hypocrisy.

□ 2300

A REPORT FROM INDIANA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMITH of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I would like to share with my colleagues in the House a report on what I learn when Ruthie and I go home to Indiana each weekend—a Report from Indiana if you will.

This weekend I had the privilege of attending the "promise keeper men's conference." We have talked a great deal about how this new Republican Congress is keeping our promises made to the American people to change Washington by reducing the size and scope of the Federal Government cutting taxes and balancing the budget.

This conference was about keeping promises at a much more fundamental level.

And the results are phenomenal 62,000 men came from throughout the midwest to the Hoosierdome in downtown Indianapolis to reaffirm their faith and their commitment to their families.

There is nothing quite like joining in with 62,000 men singing church campfire songs at the top of their lungs.

Tony Evans—who was chaplain to the Dallas Cowboys—spoke about how committed individuals are the building blocks of our society.

When we keep our promise to live the standards of our faith, we become leaders. As strong individuals we can lead our family—and pass on these values to our children. Strong families make up healthy communities—where we live out the commandment to love our neighbors and ourselves. And, Tony Evans pointed out healthy communities are the building blocks of good States and good States build strong Nation. A United States, committed to the moral principles that have always made our country strong, will lead the world and establish freedom for all mankind.

I was profoundly struck by Tony Evans' message—as I realized that each of us, by keeping faith with promises we make are an integral part to restoring, strengthening, and building the American dream.

And I was even more profoundly struck on Sunday morning when I attended a 25th wedding celebration of

two friends who have and are living out this principle.

Anne and Max Smith invited their friends to join them at a service at Westfield Friends Meeting, a quaint little county church just outside Hagerstown, IN.

Max is a full time farmer; Anne works at the local welfare office helping children. They both have a strong faith that has been the touchstone of their busy lives. On that faith they built a strong family—raising two children, Brent and Shellie, of their own.

Their strong family let them reach out to help others in their community. At a testimonial lunch after the service, three different young people spoke about how Max and Anne had "adopted them" into their family and given them a chance in life.

Max serves the community as county commissioner, spending countless hours worrying about county services, from fixing back roads in rural Wayne County to administering relief to the poor.

Anne and Max have both been promise keepers. Their commitment has made their church, their community, their county, the State of Indiana, and America a better place to live. And I was honored to be a small part of their celebration of 25 years of marriage.

Mr. Speaker, that's the report from Indiana for this week.

THE SUPREME COURT RULING ON REDISTRICTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12th, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for a period of time not to extend beyond midnight, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to talk about a decision that was handed down by the Supreme Court today. I find it very ironic that the Supreme Court would rule in a case that affects the District, the 11th District of Georgia, to be unconstitutional, and it is ironic that we stand at a time in our history that we are trying to bring about a color blind society. We are trying to bring about a democracy to represent all of the people, and the Supreme Court ruled today that the 11th District of Georgia is unconstitutional, and ruled that the Fourth Congressional District, the district which I represent, did not rule on that district at all, simply because the plaintiffs in that case did not have standing.

Tonight I wanted to take just a moment to talk about some of the districts that are majority districts across this country that look just as irregular as the majority minority districts in this country, and try to give some sense of understanding as to why would courts and why would people across America, even entertain the thought that districts, simply because of their shape and simply because of their appearance, are unconstitutional.