

The law implementing the Compact of Free Association authorized reimbursement to Guam for the impact of this policy. Today, over 8,000 foreign citizens, 6 percent of our population, now legally reside on Guam.

The Government of Guam has carried the water for this ill-conceived immigration policy since 1986 and has incurred costs in excess of \$70 million. I urge my colleagues to support an amendment that I will offer to the Interior appropriations bill to restore the administration's request of \$4.58 million for Guam compact-impact aid. Guam may be 10,000 miles away, but on this immigration issue, Guam will not buy the excuse that the Federal Government lost our compact-impact check in the mail.

#### MEDICARE OR MEDISCARE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we have heard it again this morning. The gentlewoman from Connecticut brings it up. The only change the guardians of the old order want to make is to change the name from Medicare to Mediscare. They are intent on scaring senior citizens, despite the report of the Medicare Trustees that tell us that Medicare goes broke over the next few years if we fail to do anything.

The new majority is committed to governing this Nation, is committed to saving Medicare, and, yes, is committed to a variety of alternatives. Far be it from the fear tactics of one-size-fits-all with one type of tactic to use. We want to broaden the options, to save Medicare for future generations, because our responsibility to govern allows us to do nothing less.

□ 1020

#### THE V-CHIP

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the violence chip received the endorsement of the President of the United States.

This is a watershed moment in the fight for balance between parents who feel overwhelmed by the 200-channel television world of the future, and those who believe that the first amendment denies government any role in managing television.

Parents can set their sets to block out violent shows, and the V-chip does the rest. Any show carrying a rating that the parent wants to keep out, gets blocked.

For those of you who can't program the clock on your VCR, this is easier. If you want, you can set it once and not reset it until your kids are grown.

In the meantime, a parent knows that at least in his or her living room,

there is an oasis of peace and quiet, free from the guns and beatings and mayhem and sexual material that is so frequently used to attract TV audiences.

This is nothing more or less than an on-off button, modernized for today's world. Parents can't be home all day, so technology will block shows until parents get home.

It is not censorship, it is parental choice.

It is not content regulation, it is parental mobilization.

It is not big brother, it is big mother and big father.

Ninety percent of parents polled want it. Within the next couple of days the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICK- EY], and I will be introducing legislation to advance this cause.

#### THE FISCAL YEAR 1995 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL AND RE- SCISSIONS

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, as H.R. 1944, the House-passed rescission and emergency supplemental bill, wallows on the other side of this Nation's Capitol, the people's business again is held captive by a tiny fragment of the makeup of the U.S. Congress.

Their opposition to making government smaller and more efficient creates collateral damage to which they seemingly turn a blind eye to. They must be made aware that H.R. 1944 is not just about deficit reduction, timber salvage or any other partisan issue. H.R. 1944 is about victims of flood, earthquake, and terror.

I represent the area of Oklahoma City that was rocked by a man-made devastation never before seen in this country. H.R. 1944 contains crucial aid to help this damaged but healing city get back on its feet. I would plead with those who oppose this measure to listen to the calls of the President, congressional leadership, and overwhelming majorities in each House to free this legislation. It's time we put closure on this issue and put the people's business above partisan politics.

#### CHINA AND HUMAN RIGHTS

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

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Dr. Harry Wu of Milpitas, CA, a Chinese-born American citizen, has campaigned to publicize conditions in the Chinese labor camps. He has recently been arrested and charged with espionage by the Chinese government, and he could face execution if convicted. Dr. Harry Wu's only crime is

exposing the true conditions and purposes of these Chinese labor camps.

Our message, Mr. Speaker, to the Chinese Government and to the world must be crystal clear. No American citizen shall be arrested and mistreated anywhere in the world without all Americans being threatened and all Americans responding.

The Congress will soon be considering most-favored-nation trade status with China. The Chinese are currently running a \$36 billion a year trade surplus with us. Without MFN, Mr. Speaker, most of its exports will cease. Let us make Dr. Wu the \$36 billion man and withhold MFN from these barbaric goons.

#### ACCESS TO THE PRESIDENT CAN BE PURCHASED

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is absolutely right about Harry Wu.

I want to quote this morning in the spirit of bipartisanship from a book that President Clinton wrote in 1992 called "Putting People First":

American politics is being held hostage by big money interests, including political action committees, lobbies and cliques of \$100,000 donors who buy access to Congress and the White House.

The President actually wrote that in 1992. It is right out of "Putting People First." Well, last week we saw the culmination of what has been a rather shameless parade to the well and a spectacle of self-righteousness unequaled in history. Every day that the House is in session, liberals take to the House floor and denounce and beat their chests about the floods of special interest money. Their self-righteous whimpers can be heard for miles from here.

But we just had the disclosure that the DNC is not immune. Apparently, look what is happening. For \$100,000 you can go to dinner at the White House four times, get a spot on a trade mission. For \$50,000 you get a Presidential dinner plus high-level briefings.

Come on. Let us back off and get real.

#### WE JUST NEED THE GUTS TO PAY FOR MEDICARE

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

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have a plan to cut \$270 billion from Medicare between now and the year 2002. During that same period, they plan to cut at least \$245 billion in taxes for the most affluent in our country. Does that sound like they are concerned about the senior citizens in our country?

The Republicans claim that Democrats are engaging in scare tactics.

They want the public to believe that \$270 billion in Medicare cuts will be pain-free and that seniors will be better off, maybe even have more freedom. Seniors have the freedom of choice right now. They can go to their own doctor. They can go to their own hospital. Let me reiterate to my Republican colleagues, this is free enterprise.

I think the public would be a little more confident in the Republican promises if the Medicare cuts were driven by a genuine health care concern instead of the balanced budget. Medicare is not bankrupt any more than the Defense Department is bankrupt. If you want to have senior citizen health care, you have to pay for it. You have to pay for it every year just like we have to pay for the Defense Department.

The Medicare system is not bankrupt. We just need to have the guts to pay for it.

**PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1868, FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996**

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 177 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 177

*Resolved*, That during further consideration of H.R. 1868 pursuant to House Resolution 170, consideration of the bill for amendment in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union shall proceed without intervening motion except the amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each of those amendments may be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against amendments printed in the report are waived. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment made in order by this resolution. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may reduce to not less than five minutes the time for voting by electronic device on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote by electronic device without intervening business, provided that the time for voting by electronic device on the first in any series of questions shall be not less than fifteen minutes. Immediately after disposition of the amendments printed in the report, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DICKEY). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] pending which time 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. GOSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I think before we start the proceedings this morning that we all want to be reminded of the fact that our good friend and colleague, the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MOAKLEY, is in the hospital. We wish him Godspeed and early return and all good health.

Mr. Speaker, in the week leading up to the Fourth of July break, we witnessed one of the longest campaigns of dilatory floor tactics in the recent history of the House of Representatives. That campaign continues. Yesterday's Roll Call quotes a minority leadership aide as saying, "We are blowing up the House on Monday." Well, it is Tuesday and we are still here, and we are pleased about that.

The minority Members have made references to guerilla warfare. Mr. Speaker, these are not the sentiments of the people of the United States who are interested in working for the national interest. Unfortunately, it is clear that the minority has decided to hold the foreign operations bill and possibly other legislation hostage in order to grandstand on what is an extraneous issue and now one that I hope is behind us and resolved.

To anyone who still has questions about the matter of committee ratios, I simply urge them to look at the history of ratios in the House under Democratic rule. I think the evidence very clearly shows, as we pointed out in debate yesterday, that the Republicans indeed are more generous to the minority on the Committee on Ways and Means than we have experienced when it was the other way around. So let us end that discussion and get on with the business.

Mr. Speaker, the majority is here to do the people's business and today that business is the passage of the foreign operations appropriations bill. Reluctantly, I am here with a second rule, a rule that will enable us to finish this bill and continue the important work of considering appropriations bills. As we all know, we have many left to go before the August recess.

As Members are aware, under the rules of the House, limitation amendments to appropriation bills are subject to the majority leader's motion to rise. In fact, we could cut off all debate here and now and proceed to final passage. But at this point we choose not to do that. But it is an important point, so let me restate it. Under the rules, we could end the amending process right now. But we are not going to do that. Instead we have crafted a rule to ensure that the four pending amend-

ments are protected and each one has adequate debate time.

To those who may rise to claim that this rule is not fair, I would point out the hours upon hours that this body has spent voting on unnecessary motions already on this appropriations bill, procedural motions, dilatory motions, time that could have been used to finish the bill under a completely open rule.

By calculations of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if I have read his quotes right, so far 27 hours have been used in debate on this, which is 5 more than we used to debate Desert Storm in 1991, and that involved hostile open warfare.

This rule strikes an important balance between the rights of Members to offer amendments, most notably the three Democrat Members, I say the three Democrat Members who still have amendments pending are being provided for under this rule, and one other amendment as well, and the need to finish consideration of this legislation in a timely manner, which is our responsibility.

I think this is the right balance. It allows those who had amendments pending to complete the business of this bill. It does get the bill moving. I urge my colleagues to support the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HALL of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to House Resolution 177, the second rule on the foreign operations appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. Approximately 2 weeks ago, on June 22 when we were debating the first rule on this bill, I stood here and commended my colleagues on the other side of the aisle for reporting an essentially open rule. Now, after several days of full and fair debate on many important amendments under the 5 minute rule, we are suddenly closing down the process.

Under this new rule, only the four amendments specified in the accompanying rules report may be offered. These are amendments by Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. They are debatable for only 20 minutes each, equally divided between an opponent and proponent. Members will not be able to strike the last word and continue debating the merits of these amendments. No Member may offer any other amendment, regardless of how meritorious it may be.

Mr. Speaker, this is no way to do business. I have stated before that some bills may require a structured rule, I have, in fact, supported structured rules on foreign operations appropriations bills in the past. However, if we are going to structure a rule, it