

I have also heard reports from one elementary school principal who must devote three classrooms, with teachers and aides, just to teach English and reading skills to immigrants.

The total reimbursement given to Guam based on the law has been \$2.5 million.

This is all that has been given to Guam in reimbursement for this dramatic impact on our society and economy. Mr. Speaker, given this legacy of the Federal Government's inability to make good on its promises, we should ask the question, What is Guam asking for in the Interior appropriations and what is Guam getting in the Interior appropriations?

These are easy questions. Guam is asking only that the Federal Government start living up to its commitment by putting in \$4.58 million that the administration requested for fiscal year 1996. Guam is not asking for Government assistance; Guam is not asking for special projects; Guam is only asking for a down payment of a long overdue bill.

And what is Guam getting? Well, the answer is simple. Currently, the Interior budget is giving Guam zero, zilch, zip, nothing, nada, tayá—no money, however you want to say it. It is time to begin paying the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this week I intend to offer an amendment to H.R. 1977, the Interior appropriations bill, to restore the funding requested by the administration for the cost of this immigration. The Federal Government cannot have a free ride at Guam's expense, on a policy Guam had no part in shaping. The Federal Government cannot open Guam to unrestricted immigration and then stick us with the bill. The Federal Government cannot pass on this unfunded mandate to Guam while leaving us alone to deal with the impact of this immigration. I urge my colleagues to support Guam's compact-impact reimbursement.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is the first day that the American citizens start working for themselves. What do I mean by that:

Yesterday was the Cost of Government Day. The American people worked from January 1 of this year to July 9 of this year for the government. I say to my colleagues, "If you add up all the taxes paid on the local, State, and Federal level, and the cost of regulation, 52 cents out of every hard-earned dollar that the American people earn goes to the government. Out of the 365 days in the calendar year, the American people worked 189.9 days for the government and the regulatory bureaucracy. They worked 15.3 days for defense, 13½ days for interest on the

national debt, 28.7 days for Social Security and Medicare, 51.1 days for State and local taxes and regulations, 41.7 days for Federal regulations, and 35.6 days for other Federal programs."

I ask my colleagues, "Did you know that more than half of the money that you earn goes to the government? Actually 52 cents of every dollar, every dollar earned by the average worker, is spent on government, tax and regulations? This means that you spend more time working for the government than you do for yourself and your family. It means that only 48 cents out of every dollar earned by the American family is available to pay for housing, food, education, transportation, and other essentials."

Mr. Speaker, this is unconscionable and immoral. By recognizing government-imposed costs and regulations, we can begin to increase public awareness of the 52-cent swindle.

As chairman of Cost of Government Day I say to my colleagues, "I urge you to join me in highlighting the cost of government to the average American family by giving a 1-minute or participating in the press conferences to come, and I urge all my colleagues to do so."

True, this year, the total cost of government is estimated to be \$3.3 trillion. Nearly \$1 trillion of this is the result of regulation. The Federal Government alone is responsible for \$720 billion in hidden taxes through regulation this year. That amount equals \$2,800 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Although the burden is immense, it can be lessened quickly. If the House Republican budget proposal were to be implemented, the Cost of Government Day would be 17 days earlier by the year 2002. That would allow Americans to work 2½ weeks longer for themselves and their families. Regulatory and legal reforms could move the Cost of Government Day to even earlier.

Mr. Speaker, we need these budget, legal, and regulatory reforms in order to reduce the Government's negative impact on the American family.

Mr. Speaker, July 9 marks the third annual Cost of Government Day. Cost of Government Day is an excellent opportunity to drive home the need for less government spending and more regulatory reform. The 104th Congress has made an excellent start. Passage and implementation of the House Republican budget will make Cost of Government Day come much quicker and the American family be able to spend more of its hard-earned dollars for things they think are important rather than for what some bureaucrat thinks is important.

Mr. Speaker, over in the other body they are starting the debate on regulatory reform, and the first thing out of the box for the last week has been an absolute unheralded attack on Members of Congress that are trying to bring some good science and common sense to regulations in this country.

We have been attacked with the notion that we are destroying the environment, that we are removing safety. Indeed people are attacking us for even costing lives. What we are talking about is bringing reasonableness to regulations.

Let me just go over a couple of these issues that show how crazy and extreme the regulatory environment in this country has gotten. In Sacramento, CA, residents are reeling over a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ruling last fall which added three varieties of fairy shrimp to the endangered species list. The agency relied on a one-paragraph petition submitted by a Davis, CA, botanist in 1990 even though millions of hardy shrimp can be found in California, Europe, Asia, Australia, and Africa. The decision has shut down a pony ranch that housed a Sacramento program for the needy and disabled children and could cost the Sacramento area housing industry \$500 million.

That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to stop. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring reasonableness to. That is the kind of regulation that we are trying to bring forward, regulatory reform to bring forward, to stop the cost. That is a direct cost to the American people, thereby a direct cost to the American family.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really sad that yesterday was the Cost of Government Day, that the American family has to work more than half the year for the government. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we need to put policies forward in this country that lessen the number of days that the American family has to work for their Government and increase the number of days that the American family can work for themselves.

GLOSSING OVER THE ROUGH SPOTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, when credible and respected observer organizations, notably the International Republican Institute, returned from the June 25 elections in Haiti to report their documented observations—both the good and the bad—they were not received with open arms. It was more like a shoot-the-messenger situation here and elsewhere in Washington because at that time international organizations, the Clinton administration officials, and some of the national media even were too busy painting rosy pictures of what was going on in Haiti—glossing over widespread irregularities in the elections that actually happened hailing the relatively non-violent atmosphere on election day as the measure of a successful electoral

process in Haiti, never mind the widespread and serious mismanagement, chaos, confusion, and disorganization that disenfranchised so many candidates and so many voters.

Now the flurry of election reports of 2 weeks ago in Haiti has dwindled to a few inches of space in the major papers. Last Friday, for example, the news that the run-off elections, the important run-off elections scheduled for the end of this month were being pushed back to August. This was buried in the deepest recesses of the major papers. Even the New York Times barely gave it mention, and none among the major media dared question the wisdom of the provisional electoral council's intention to announce results on this past Saturday despite the protests of most of the parties that participated in the election on June 25.

This week, the news that 23 of the 27 parties who actually participated in the elections of June 25 in Haiti have signed official communiques calling for the elections to be annulled, and that still has not made the cut in the smattering of the Haiti-related articles in the major press outlets in this country either.

The New York Times did take the time to editorialize and declare the delay of the run-offs as a step that will give officials time to learn from their mistakes. Of course, some might question whether or not it is appropriate to hold a run-off for an election that is being challenged by almost all the participants, because it was characterized by the widespread disenfranchisement of voters and candidates alike, as we now all know.

But the Clinton administration marches onward down the yellow brick road. At the State Department briefing this weekend, Spokesman Burns declared that Haiti "now has a functioning democracy * * *" and that the administration believes " * * * the Haitians did rather well, if you look at this election as it should be properly viewed in the context of the environment in Haiti and the history of Haiti."

Well, indeed, it is good news that democracy has come to Haiti. Now perhaps we can bring back thousands of troops that are down there at taxpayers expense providing security and stability in that country and perhaps we can cut back on the hundreds of millions of dollars being sent to Haiti every day to help get democracy started.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is the Haitian people who toiled long and hard on election day trying to make the best of a bad process deserve more than the cursory analysis and condescending statements of support we have been hearing from the administration and the media in this country.

Rather than pressure to simply move on, Haitians need the support of the White House, the State Department and the American media to find the truth of what actually went wrong in

the elections on the 25th—and to get it fixed. And before this December's Presidential elections because they are going to be very important, and more importantly for the American people, we need to be kept abreast of where are the taxdollars the Clinton administration has been doling out for the elections and for U.S. operations in Haiti? And what good, if any, they are doing? It is a lot of money. The White House owes us an accounting and it is overdue.

At the most basic level, these elections were about Haitians being free to elect the entire local governmental structure in Haiti and a new national parliament, a congress, being free to construct in those offices the checks and balances envisioned and provided for in the new Haitian constitution. The success of the process will determine how soon we can bring our troops home and whether or not anything lasting, in fact, does come out of all the money, time, and effort the American people have poured into that small friendly Caribbean nation.

Glossing over the rough spots in this process does not help any of the parties involved.

I say to my colleagues, "If you want to shoot the messenger, go ahead, but the fact of it is that there are some problems, and they need to be fixed."

Even the distinguished New York Times today has had the temerity to suggest what they would not suggest 2 weeks ago after the elections, and I quote from the editorial page from the Times today: "Haiti is wise to postpone its next round of elections. The first round, on June 25, was marred by massive disorganization," et cetera. They would not admit that, and now they admit it. We are making progress. We are getting at the truth.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY CELEBRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 9, was the kind of day when you did not know whether you should laugh or cry. It was a kind of day when you did not know whether you should mourn or celebrate. You see yesterday, July 9, was Government Free Day. Up until yesterday every American worked full-time just to pay for the costs of government. Until about mid-May we all worked to pay the costs of Federal, State, and local taxes, and then incredibly, from mid-May until July 9, every American worked full-time just to pay the cost of unfunded Federal mandates. It was the day on which one would cry and mourn that he had spent so much of his time working for government. But it was also a day in which we could look forward to today; you might celebrate that, the

first day on which you could earn any money for yourself.

The average American this year worked a bit more than 189 days to pay for the cost of government. He has left just a bit more than 175 days to do all the things that one needs to do. Father and mother work to pay the mortgage, save money for an education, to prepare for their retirement, to take care of their sicknesses, and all of this has to be done in 175 days after working a bit more than 189 days for the government.

Let us kind of put this in perspective. According to Prof. Charles Adams, author of "For Good and Evil," which is a history of taxation published in 1933, peasant serfs in the Mongol Empire in the period of Genghis Khan had to give their feudal lords just one-tenth of what they produced. When you consider how oppressed we think those people were in giving one-tenth of their income, what do you have to say about us who had to work about 52 percent of this year to pay for the cost of government?

In the last two elections it was a revolution that began at the polling places, and all across America Americans said enough is enough, and they voted to begin to return this country to that vision of our forefathers. The kind of government that they envisioned was stated by Thomas Jefferson when he indicated that the government which governs best is the government which governs least. We have got to be about a million miles from that dream of Thomas Jefferson, and that Abraham Lincoln in a period of crisis in our country said it just as well. He said it differently. He said that government should only do for its citizens what they cannot do for themselves.

Someone has said that considering how ineffective government is, how much it has interfered with our families, how much it has depreciated the business environment, that we ought to be thankful that we do not get all the government that we pay for. If government was efficient and effective in doing what it does, it would have done even more damage to our families and to our economy.

Another thing that really causes one to stop and think is the realization that after 7 years of balancing the budget, as my colleague from Texas indicated just a little earlier, we will have moved back the Cost of Government Day just 17 days. I do not think that that is what Americans had in mind when they went to the polling places these last two elections and began this revolution.

Moving back the Cost of Government Day just 17 days after 7 years; that is not enough. That is not what Americans had in mind. We have just begun this battle to take back our country and to return it to the kind of country envisioned by our forefathers. Think about it, America.