

Mr. ROEMER. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I could want to let the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] have just one question, and let the gentleman get off to Margaritaville.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROEMER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Majority Leader, have a great flight, but when you fly away, think about working on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays from 9 a.m. to 9 p.m., and I would appreciate that.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has been very generous.

If the gentleman will continue to yield for one quick moment, I think we have a statement here that needs to be clarified. I would like to make it very clear so there is no misunderstanding regarding working on Monday, July 31. It is very clear that we will work, and it will be necessary for us to work on that, but hopefully not on the weekend before.

Mr. FAZIO. I thank the leader for his comments.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2076, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, STATE, AND JUSTICE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-200) on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2076), making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JULY 24, 1995

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on vote 547, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, I inadvertently voted "yes." I intended to vote "no," and I request that the RECORD reflect that.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1404

Mr. PAYNE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 1404.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE RICHARD K. ARMEY TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 20, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable RICHARD K. ARMEY to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

NEWT GINGRICH,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the designation is agreed to. There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GOSS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE WORST OF TIMES FOR AMERICA'S WOMEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado, [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I must say this has been really quite a week. There was some question whether I wanted to stay and do a special order. The more I looked at what happened in this week, I really feel it is very historic and it is very important to take the floor and say to the American people that I hope they are digesting what is transpiring. Right now, if we look at all the things going on between Waco hearings, Whitewater hearings, all the trials on television and Bosnia, I think very few people realize what is transpiring to their rights here.

This week ended with such a fitting end that really says it all. As we know, our Speaker kind of got elected as the prince of angry white men, and I think it is very fitting that he ended up celebrating the end of this week where he is now. We have our Speaker off at the Bohemian Club. Many people may say, "what is the Bohemian Club? Why do we think we heard that name?" We heard it a lot during the prior Republican administration, and then we have not heard it for quite some time. However, the Speaker has put it back into our whole lexicon.

Herbert Hoover once called the Bohemian Club and its annual party the greatest men's club on Earth. The San Diego Union described it the following way:

The Bohemian Club is known for its raucous campouts in the grove. Their woods north of San Francisco are where powerful politicians, executives, and many others, partially clad or dressed in drag, meet each year for 2 weeks of carousing and networking. The grove gatherings are known for raunchy skits, speechmaking, sing-along, gambling, open urination on trees, and other targets.

I guess they are all there celebrating, because at the end of this week they will all say it probably is the best of times for rich white men in America, and so obviously that is where the Speaker belongs.

However, I must say after this week, it is really the worst of times for America's women. This has been a week where issues on women have been absolutely pounded. Things we never thought we would see happen have happened on this floor, and I do not think America's women know it. Women, if you want to know why they are out there running around in the trees, partially clothed, no women are allowed, people are picketing, all sorts of noise going on in San Francisco, let me tell the Members what the Speaker and his friends are celebrating.

No. 1, they passed a ban so that Federal employees cannot even purchase health insurance that would cover perfectly legal abortion rights. Even for rape and incest they cannot buy health insurance. That is pretty astounding, and for people who believe in individual rights, that is really amazing.

No. 2, the 25-year-old family planning program that is known as title 10, that provides all sorts of family planning services, pelvic exams, Pap smears, screening for sexually transmitted diseases, and many other things, that was zeroed out this week.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, do I understand, I would ask the gentlewoman, that, for example, Planned Parenthood of Boston and planned parenthood organizations and other community family planning across the country have not just been reduced in scope, like so many of the slash-and-burn efforts here in the Congress this week, but have been totally eliminated in the measure that came out of the appropriations bill?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct.

Mr. DOGGETT. The gentlewoman is not just talking about the controversial subject of abortion, that right being denied for all of our Federal employees and for all of their families, but the gentlewoman is talking about any form of Federal participation in family planning for families that want to plan, who do not want to face the choice of abortion, but want to actually have a variety of alternatives presented for family planning, they are going to get zero, zip, in the way of Federal support?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas has really hit the nail on the head. I think the gentleman from Texas probably also knows, because he has visited those family planning clinics, many of them are the primary care for many of America's low-income women during their childbearing age. That is where they go for their physical, their Pap smears, their breast

checks, that is where they go for their entire range of health care services during that period in their life. To just zero it out, and say there will be no family planning, absolutely zero it out, which I still cannot believe it happened, but they did, because we heard so many people who were antiabortion saying, "But I am always for family planning."

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, joining in with the gentleman from Texas and the gentlewoman from Colorado, this is a 25-year-old program that the Federal Government has been involved in. Not only does it provide funding for organizations, private and nonprofit, like Planned Parenthood, but it also provides grants to public entities and agencies. Those agencies have served an estimated 4.3 million people in 1995 through a network of 4,200 clinics provide key reproductive services. The gentlewoman has talked about those services, services that are screening for sexually transmitted diseases, for Pap tests, for pelvic exams, and other important tests. What essentially they are doing is cutting off health care, health care to women and to young ladies and to girls.

I rise in consternation with what has happened this week, because I am a father of a young teenager. Telling her over the phone this week about this, she was absolutely shocked. She said, "Daddy, does that mean because you buy Blue Cross health insurance from the Federal Government, that if I get raped, that your health care policy cannot take care of the medical exam that I would have to have and the services that I might need?" And I said, "Yes, isn't that disgusting?" She said, "I can't believe it. You mean that is what you have done in Congress this week?"

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It was not a proud week. It is not a proud week, and it is very difficult to explain. I am glad the gentleman from California was awake and the gentleman from Texas was awake. I do not know how we get everyone else awake to understand it. We talk about fundamentalists in other countries, but it seems like fundamentalists kind of took over this Congress, because when you go after family planning, that is really kind of as American as apple pie.

Mr. DOGGETT. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield further, indeed, the family planning program as described by our colleague, the gentleman from California, it actually is a program that has had support even of some of the people that have probably been members of the Bohemian Club. It has had broad bipartisan support from Republicans and Democrats until the extremists took control of the committee, is that not correct?

□ 1800

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman from Texas always has such an interesting mind.

You know, I had never thought of that, but I will bet if you could poll the members of the Bohemian Club, you would find a very high percentage of them are significant donors to Planned Parenthood. Because I think that is the one thing I have always found very interesting on family planning, that most people understand how important it is and contribute a lot.

But as much as they contribute, Federal funding has always been very, very essential, because there are so many women in their childbearing age, and they need this—we are talking visits every 6 months to a year. It is very essential. You cannot just say, well, they had their visits so they do not need to go back for 40 years. Wrong, believe me.

So my guess is that there are an awful lot of the contributors there, and I wonder if they would be frolicking with the Speaker quite as much and skipping through the trees, doing whatever they do, if they knew that while he was away the appropriations zeroed this out.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentlewoman yield for a moment?

Let me just add on that. You realize that I am from California, and the Bohemian Club Grove is in Marin County, CA, and it has been there for over about 100 years, I think, of people. It is sort of the corporate heads of America go there, and the irony is that their own corporations, 70 percent of all the private health care plans in America, provide services which Congress denied to Federal employees.

So there is a—I mean, this—if you are going to make government more like the private sector, you certainly do not want to begin by denying health care, medical services to women that the private sector, major corporations in America and those CEO's that are running around, as you say, in the Bohemian Club Grove are providing to their own employees.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Well, I think that is a very interesting point, too.

Is it not a shame—you know, the gentleman from Ohio often says, "Beam me up." Is not it a shame the three of us cannot be beamed up to the Bohemian Club and go around and run a poll saying to all the people there playing in the trees at camp, "Did you know that we have just made Federal employees second-class citizens this week? Did you know we just zeroed out family planning? Did you know we also unraveled Roe versus Wade and, for the first time, this House has declared a medical procedure illegal, which is absolutely astounding?"

And we could say, "Did you know this week we had a committee prohibit medical schools from teaching, even teaching abortion procedures. That is pretty interesting. Did you know we prohibited in one of the committee

Federal funding on human embryos, which is going to hamper contraceptive research, and also the search to look for curing birth defects and different diseases?"

We could lay a whole bunch of things on these guys, and I honestly think they would be with us. They may be celebrating without knowing what has really been done.

Mr. FARR. Did you know, following up on that, that the defense authorization bill prohibits private-funded abortions for our service men and women, and I say men because they are overseas with their families, from being performed in overseas military hospitals? Private services.

So that means if you are in the military or you are a military dependent and you want to use your own money and you choose your own military hospitals, which we have there for our military active duty personnel, that you are denied. You have got to go out into the foreign market.

At what risk do you go at that foreign market? We are subjecting people who are giving their lives to military service from just the basic benefits that their own relatives receive working for private corporations in America.

We have gone—this antiwoman attitude in this Congress is, I think, beginning to show itself so strongly in how we are trying to set up women as a second-class citizenship in America.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You know, I am very pleased that both of you came to talk about this, because usually it is the women who are here railing about this, and maybe that is why we do not get through. But it is really great to have people here who do get it and who are starting to be as frightened as some of us, wondering what is coming next.

I mean, we are getting ready to celebrate women having had the vote for 75 years. Maybe this is the year we really learn how to start using the vote if we see much more of this going backward.

Mr. DOGGETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I would be delighted to.

Mr. DOGGETT. So we have seen our military forces being treated as second-class citizens. They are discriminated against even in the case of rape of a servicewoman or the spouse of a serviceman. These services are not available.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Absolutely. Even if you are overseas.

Mr. DOGGETT. This week the members of our Federal work force all across the country, whether it is a park ranger or a nurse in a VA hospital or a security person right here at the Capitol, a young woman doing that very important work, again, if there is rape or incest, there is discrimination. No longer will they be able to have health care services available to other Americans.

And then, in addition to that, we have even got these extremists coming

in and saying they will dictate accreditation standards for medical schools, they will say what kind of research we can and cannot have.

With all of this interference in the lives of young American women, where you say do not consult with your spouse, do not consult with your minister or rabbi, do not consult with your family, go take it up with your Congressman and interfere in those private decisions, do you think that instead of hearing so much in the news about angry men, we ought to be hearing something about angry young women who should be angered and upset that extremists would do this to them and interfere in their very most personal decisions?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. That is precisely my point. I think if they just had any idea what is happening, they would be very angry.

And my fear is about a year from now, when this starts to really have an impact, they are going to come running through our doors screaming, "Why didn't anyone tell us?"

I feel rather like Paul Revere riding through saying the British are coming. Only we are saying the fundamentalists have won. You know, we are in real trouble here.

I also have to say that, for every woman, there are some very serious thoughts here about who in the world would think about being an OB-GYN.

If you were a young man 30 years old and you are thinking about a specialty in medical school, would you be an OB-GYN with the Congress here telling you what kind of procedures you can have, what kind of research you can do, what you can and cannot learn in medical school, what you can and cannot say to your patients and also cutting funding right and left?

And, furthermore, if you ever did it and you ever even treated one woman because you were concerned about her condition, you could never be Surgeon General, like Dr. Foster.

Mr. DOGGETT. When you get put on one of these wanted posters which have now spread to the political realm, but one group is putting up wanted posters for physicians performing legal procedures and another group is putting up wanted posters for Members of Congress who have the audacity to support that basic constitutional right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. You do wonder who is running the show.

I am one of the people on the wanted poster for politicians, so I now know how the doctors who are on those wanted posters feel. And if you were a young person planning your future, I do not think you would go sign up to be an OB-GYN, such as your daughter or I think your daughter—

Mr. DOGGETT. She will be getting into medical school this next month. I know that will be one of the areas that she studies in her practice, but I have to say, as a father, I cannot help but have concern that if she chooses to go into that area of specialty she may ac-

tually risk her life, as so many physicians are doing today, as so many people at these Planned Parenthood and other community planning agencies risk their lives to simply provide basic health care services that our young American women need.

Mr. DOGGETT. What is so surprising about all this is this is the year of the conservative attitude in the House of Representatives and Congress, an the whole attitude here is get government off your back. But, indeed, these policies get government so far involved in the most personal issues in one's life. Because in order to monitor and prohibit you have got to police it.

I cannot imagine what kind of trickle-down enforcement procedures are going to be there. And the message it says, let me just read you from a Sara Lowenthal, who lives in Santa Cruz, a community that I represent. She wrote this to me. She says, "As an HIV educator who works directly with at-risk teens, the attack on title X scares me. One of the most direct, effective and influential ways that local teens can get information about HIV is through Planned Parenthood. The elimination of title X is not just a rightist attack on reproductive rights. It is a deconstruction of an educational block that protects Santa Cruz teens from HIV. I am deeply disheartened by the actions of the radical right."

She is an educator at the local level, and these educators are hard to get, because they do not get paid a lot. They volunteer a lot of their time. And I think that message is not just a message about what specialty to go in. It is also a negative message about what kind of an educator to become.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It is truly amazing that as we are saying get government out of regulation, get government out of all these areas, we are moving right into the classroom, into the doctor's office, into people's bedrooms, into all of these different areas, and we are going to totally regulate this area vis-a-vis women, and, as I say, long term, since almost all women get their primary care from OB-GYN's.

If we do not have any good OB-GYN's, we are all in trouble in the future if we do not have good doctors watching after our health care.

There are some other instances that are kind of did-you-knows this week. I mean, we all saw Kiri Jewell, that beautiful young 14-year-old, talking about the problems that she had had—I mean, I get chills even thinking about it. But her father having to go to court and do all of this because at 10 she is raped by David Koresh.

Well, did you know there are Members in this body who are saying, "That is really a side show, that is really irrelevant, that really did not matter"?

I mean, has the NRA so totally taken this place over we cannot hear a young woman's voice saying, "Let me tell you what happened to me in Waco" and how she had been taught to teach—to do suicide by David Koresh? They do not hear.

We had many couples come here wanting to talk about the abortion procedure outlawed by the Committee on the Judiciary, and only one person got to testify. Nobody listened to their voices. It is like they are road kill. We have an agenda. We are rolling right over you. And these were all people who had gone through very, very difficult trying times and thought that they had a right to petition their government.

Mr. DOGGETT. If any of these young women came today to the Congress where all of us were working, this House in session past midnight last night—I know our crime task force got together before 8 this morning. If any of those young women or young men came here to this Congress, would they have found Speaker GINGRICH here today?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. No. He is in California playing in the trees.

Mr. DOGGETT. What is going on out there? I missed the first part of your remarks.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I must say, I was really surprised when I read in the New York Times, and I have seen it in several other newspapers now so I assume it is true, that the Speaker today arrived at the Bohemian Club's 2-week camp-out.

And, you know, I guess neither one of you were here when we used to have incidents about that. If you remember, there were women trying to get hired by the Bohemian Club at one time, and they said, no, they would never—they did not care what the Federal law said, they would never hire women because it would inhibit the members in their 2-week frolic.

I am not quite sure what they all do, but, apparently, it is quite a frolic.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is he gone for 2 weeks?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I think he is probably coming back next week, but I do not really know. I guess it started last week, so he got out there today.

But while we are here, he is playing, and we are doing some very serious things. And I just—I find these kind of—I guess it is a group of great, powerful men that love to go to the woods, and I guess they dress up like druids and do different things. I am not quite sure. But it is some privately owned redwoods, and that is where he is.

Mr. DOGGETT. Is this part of the book tour or what.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I do not think they sell books there. I have never seen anything about them buying—I do not think they read books there either. I think they do something different.

But I understand he is coming back through Iowa and then will come here. So maybe he is selling books in Iowa.

Mr. FARR. I think that the issue here, or the symbol, is that this has been a week in which the Gingrich-led Congress, the conservative aspects of it, have taken away rights that protect women, taken away the rights to buy health care policies that provide services for medical abortions.

They have zeroed out family planning money. They have affected the defense authorization bill that prohibits private funded abortions from being performed in overseas military hospitals.

□ 1815

They have cut back, major cutbacks in the international planning funds, and then to cap that off by going off to an all-male retreat, I think, is really symbolic of this sort of take away from women or discounting women or trying to put women as secondary citizens. It is symbolic of what is going on, and I think the women of this country ought to wake up and become involved.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I certainly hope they do. I join the gentleman from California for being actually very saddened. It is actually like they are tap dancing on women's rights that have been burned this week in different legislation that have come out. I certainly am saddened by that, and I certainly hope that women in this country do wake up and start saying to people wait a minute, wait a minute, we pay the same taxes as everyone else, which we do. They do not say, "Women, hey, we are going to give a 50-percent discount because we do not think you are quite up to handling things, and we are going to micromanage your lives because we do not think you are up to handling things," and so forth.

I think women have come a long way in this country. They really have believed progress was preordained. I think most American women would be totally shocked to know this has all been done, especially family planning. We go back to where we started, family planning, research, we worked so hard to make progress that was made on trying to catch up on women's health, and, boom, 1 week it all blows up.

Mr. FARR. I as a father, you as a mother, can understand what we try to do as parents is ensure or give hope to our kids that there will be a better, sounder, safer, saner world which they can grow up in. I only have one child. It is a daughter. I guess that makes me a feminist because I really want to see the world in which women have equal opportunity.

I am very proud to tell her that just this week I met with the highest-ranking woman in the Navy, and she is coming out to be the commandant or provost of the naval postgraduate school and, I think, someday will be chief of naval operations, and I hope so. She is a very talented woman, and to be able to show symbols of where women in society have become equal to men so that she, as she grows up, and with her colleagues, that women can see that they can do everything that any male can do. We have certainly seen that in winning Olympic Gold Medals, and we will see that in Atlanta when the Olympics come, and certainly in every profession, Sally Ride being the first woman into space and so on.

But I come here as a new Member of Congress, a relatively new Member,

and I am just shocked because California is a pretty big State, and serving in the State legislature, I thought I had seen conservative politicians. But I have to tell you I never heard on the floor of the State legislature in California the kind of rhetoric I heard here this week. That led me to be so shocked that I wanted to come and join with you and share with you my concerns as a father and as a representative of one congressional district in the United States that I think that the Congress, under the new leadership, is doing a great disservice to women. It is setting up and saying, if you are a woman and you want to go into Federal employment, do not go there.

We pointed out in our dialog today, if you go into the private sector, you can receive benefits that you will not be able to receive in the public sector, not even an equal playing field for health care delivery services that we know we have a lot of teenage pregnancies, we know we have HIV issues to deal with. You deal best with that with education. That is what the title X monies are all about. Then they have taken away those things.

We have told people if you are going to go overseas, you cannot even use your private money in an American-sponsored military hospital to get these services.

What kind of message are we trying to send as a country as to how we respect women if we are going to discount, disregard, and really put them in jeopardy?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman makes a very good point. Let me ask a question of you as a father.

Do you think your daughter needs special congressional oversight, much more so than the young men that you have probably met that are her friends, do you really think that she needs this additional guidance and her doctors need additional guidance and her teachers need additional guidance? Is there something about women that I am blinded to that I do not see?

Mr. FARR. Absolutely not. I think you see it very clearly. I can see clearly now, and what I can see clearly now is that the new majority here wants to make women second-class citizens. I am appalled by that, my daughter is appalled by that, my wife is appalled by that, my father is appalled by it. I think all of our family is looking at this and saying what is going on in Washington, DC?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. It has been a very tough week. Then we hear the family-friendly stuff. People are not home enough. People are telling me they are keeping pictures of themselves by the door, "If this man comes to the door, let him in, it is your father," because they are afraid they will think it is a stranger. Nobody can ever get home. They are working hard. What we are doing is blowing everything up. This is

kind of slash-and-burn week for women's rights, I will tell you, and everything has been slashed and burned that I am aware of.

I just hope it starts to get better. I really thank the gentleman from California for joining me in this. His daughter should be very proud.

As I say, as a mother of a son and a daughter, I do not think one needs more congressional guidance than the other. They are equal in my eyes. I think they ought to be equal in the eyes of the Congress.

Mr. FARR. I absolutely agree. I hope what we do need guidance for is America, wake up. Women in this country, wake up, come to Washington. We need to hear your voices. We need to hear your concerns. We need to change attitudes here in Washington that are taking away the rights you have as citizens of this country by denying you services which all other people in our society are entitled to.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

I think this is the 200th day of this Congress in which we have been in session 300 hours longer than we were at the same time last year, and we have done more damage to women and children, the elderly. It is really not a proud record.

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRAPO). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, we are told every day about a revolution in Congress. Day after day, my colleagues from the other party, the Republican Party, advance one or another bill, and they call it or label it revolutionary.

But what is revolutionary about a bill that prohibits the government from updating and improving meat inspection? How is it revolutionary to prohibit cleaner, safer meat? And what is revolutionary about legislation that cuts environmental cleanup funds by one-third, or a bill that makes it impossibly expensive and cumbersome to protect delicate wetlands in our country?

Under this kind of legislation the Republicans advocate this year, the government would have to pay slave owners to emancipate their slaves if it was 130 years ago. In fact, the kind of things that the Republicans have talked about this year are purely and simply an effort to turn the clock back, to force us back into the darkest ages of economic exploitation.

For instance, their attitude on meat inspection is a rank arrogant betrayal of a fundamental premise of what was, at the turn of the century, a revolutionary reform, the commitment of the government to ensure that the Na-

tion's food supply is not contaminated and is safe to consume.

The back-door repeal of statutes designed to clean up the Earth, which we have been everything almost weekly, and prevent its further despoilation is simply a return to 19th century ideas that no one has any responsibility to either neighbor or to future generations.

The Republican agenda is not revolutionary. It is, plain and simple, an attack, an all-out attack on ordinary standards of decent human conduct. Decent human conduct requires that those who have great power and wealth to refrain from manufacturing and selling poisonous products, but the Republicans would say that 1906 meat inspection standards cannot be changed, cannot be made better, despite the fact that hundreds of people die every year from foul meat, and Republicans would say that land developers should be perfectly free to destroy wetlands despite the fact that these lands are the vital source of anything resembling a thriving national fishing industry.

These are not revolutionary ideas. They are merely the candles that quiet the tantrums of impatient, powerful, wealthy donors who feed endless millions of dollars into the political maw of this machine and who want nothing more than to exploit this country as ruthlessly as the robber barons did in a bygone era.

But I do not want to talk about the mindless cruelty of the present majority. These cruelties will soon enough be understood by the American people. Eventually they will have their distilled judgment as the full facts are known, and they will be, and who are smart enough to understand that this is merely a spreading of an endless banquet for the rich and the powerful and that the feast has been paid for by a vast transfer of wealth from ordinary wage-earners to the wealthier of those among us.

What I do want to talk about is the great pain and frustration that ordinary Americans feel today, the uncertainty they feel about the future.

The truth is that ordinary, law-abiding work-a-day Americans are themselves sliding backward in their feeling that they know they are. They are angry. Let there be no mistake, they are frustrated. Let there be no mistake in understanding that.

They went to see their lives get better, not worse. These frustrations are not the figments of anyone's imagination. They are the product of a real longstanding slide backward for most of our fellow citizens.

I pride myself in being in the most intimate contact one human being could have with those is that he has as actually serious responsibility that no one man could really fully fulfill to represent, a multitude, but in good faith tries to do so by being in immediate and most intimate contact.

It is understood from what I hear and where I meet every weekend when we

are in session and when we are not, I go nowhere but in the district, and the immediate beneficiaries of this frustration and anger are those that now have the power, the majority.

But their policies will make the problems worse, and they will not be able to gloat for too long.

Now, I belong to a party, and have been proud to do so since the beginning, that interprets as fundamental premise, as one that is very basic in what I tried to adhere to in all of my career, in my position first as a local representative, then as a State and now as a national since 1961.

Representation is what I have sought, no other kind of political elective office but this, and that is what I have best understood and strived to perform.

We have got to work in such ways and always at all times to redeem the great traumas of this Nation, its historic commitment that every person have a decent, hopefully rising, standard of living and being.

□ 1830

The American Revolution is not about the freedom to be exploited. It is about the freedom to political and religious expression, the freedom to be protected against an intrusive government, and it is about equal protection under the law, and it allows us the right to enjoy, above all, the fruits of your own labor.

By that standard the Republican Party on all levels fails. The Republicans are simply trying to install a whole new system of what is tantamount to exploitation exploitation of irreplaceable resources, exploitation of hard-pressed and lowly wage earners, exploitation of frustration and fear, which they hope can be used to keep quiet the very people that are being exploited.

The sad fact is the people of the country are playing a losing game. They are working harder, they are producing more, and they are being rewarded considerably less. I do not think there has been another time in modern history which this has happened that I can recall, and I have been aboard on this level now more than three decades, much more, approximating four, and I can tell you that that is my assessment.

Now it is a so-called white-collar worker whose own standard of living is declining, whose job security is threatened more and more every day, and it is a two-income family who now are finding it harder and harder to stay even or even to stay employed, and more and more professional workers are reduced to part-time employment or contract work, the equivalent of piecework in the old clothing-stitching factories, garment factories.

There were a plethora of them in the hard Depression period of my youth and that I can recall to this day, my aunts, and my mother and other relatives getting up at 4:30 in the morning, and all through the day, with the