

most lucrative of all deals in the history of House of Representatives.

Does this contract prevent mass purchases by supporters, such as GOPAC? Are the royalties 10 percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, 50 percent? Let us lay the contract on the table. Have the independent counsel review past meetings for possible conflicts of interest.

The Ethics Committee must represent the entire House, not any specific Member, and act in a timely manner. It should not take 100 days to begin acting on this matter.

LOANS TO MEXICO

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today's newspapers report that the International Monetary Fund is about to make a \$7.6 billion loan, the largest in its 50-year history, to Mexico. By far the largest contributor to the IMF is the United States.

Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago it was announced that the Clinton administration had agreed to put up \$9 billion of an \$18 billion loan package for Mexico. All this was and is being done without a vote by Congress. This is all separate from and in addition to \$40 billion in loan guarantees the President wants Congress to now approve.

Mr. Speaker, A.M. Rosenthal, the New York Times columnist, says today, "It is not common sense to lend \$40 billion more to a country whose leaders have so botched things up to be handled by the same American officials who participated in tamping down the economic truth" about Mexico's economy.

The Times also reports that Mexican officials are strongly denying they will agree to any tougher conditions to fight illegal immigration or drug trafficking to the United States.

Apparently, though, our financial powers are going to pour billions into Mexico, using taxpayer dollars, even though there is no grassroots support. In fact, there is overwhelming opposition by the American people.

CONVERSATION BETWEEN SECRETARY BABBITT AND CONGRESSMAN HAYES?

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, the Northwestern School of Law, Lewis and Clark College, has a journal that contains an article written by Secretary of the Interior Bruce Babbitt. I know you do not care.

It attacks almost every property rights ownership group in America. That you ought to care about. And what you really ought to care about is that it has a whole page devoted to a meeting Mr. Babbitt had with me, except we never had a meeting. And in

this meeting Mr. Babbitt says, "I told Hayes he was a tricky, no good devil." I know I would remember that.

He says that I responded, but I assure you that is not what I would have said. I would have said, "Silly Babbitt, tricks are for the kids."

Mr. Babbitt also says I am a Republican from Louisiana. I will tell you what: That the job he is doing in the South and in the West, that is one mistake I may not change for him.

A YEAR-LONG CAMPAIGN TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the liberal defenders of the old order said it could not happen. The Democrat-controlled Congresses of previous years would not let it happen. But finally a Republican-controlled House made it happen. We passed a balanced budget amendment last night. I would have preferred to protect the taxpayers by including a tax provision limitation in there that requires three-fifths. But it did not pass because 20 percent of the Democrats, only, supported it. Today we are going to begin a yearlong campaign to amend the Constitution to require a three-fifths' majority to raise taxes. And if it does not pass next year, the people will know what they have to do at the polls in 1996 so that we can pass a three-fifths provision in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, the balanced budget amendment represents real change, and we will continue to keep our promises made in the Contract With America. We have one down and nine to go. We need your help.

CHILD SUPPORT NOW

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, today is day 24 of Contract With America. I have reviewed the contract and I have asked myself what is in the contract for children. I have carefully reviewed the Personal Responsibility Act and there are no child support provisions.

Child support is the cornerstone of welfare reform. We cannot have successful welfare reform without strong child support enforcement provisions.

It is time to address this issue head on. It is day 24 of the contract. We need to set goals on child support enforcement legislation now.

We need to send a message to the American people that we are serious about welfare reform. A tough child support system requires both parents to live up to their responsibilities.

Out-of-wedlock births have increased. There is no such thing as an illegitimate baby. We need to send a message to the noncustodial parent who is one-half responsible for the birth of the child. The parent needs to

know of his obligation to support the child.

Massachusetts has been very successful with child support enforcement and should serve as a role model for the rest of the country. Massachusetts has increased its child support collection rate from 51 percent to 67 percent over a 3-year period.

We need child support enforcement legislation at the Federal level. Unfortunately, child support enforcement is not adequately addressed in the contract.

It is day 24. Where is child support in the contract?

TRIBUTE TO ELAINE POVICH

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity Wednesday night to attend the Washington Press club dinner, and I also was pleased to take note of the fact that the Dirksen Congressional Research Center chose Elaine Povich as the recipient of the Award for the Best Reporting of Congress.

Now, past winners have included Cokie Roberts, Marty Tolchin, John Dancy, Adam Clymer, and Helen Dewar.

Elaine is the chief congressional correspondent for the Chicago Tribune. Her articles educate and enlighten millions of people throughout Illinois.

Most notably, her recent work on the development of health care legislation in Congress gave all her readers a chance to see how this place really works. She took an extremely complex issue and process and made them both comprehensible.

I personally have enjoyed Elaine's work for years, and I know that she is deserving of the great honor of being named the recipient of this award from the Dirksen Research Center.

Congratulations, Elaine, keep up the good work.

Mr. Speaker, I include Elaine's biography at this point:

BIOGRAPHY OF ELAINE S. POVICH

Elaine S. Povich is a Capitol Hill correspondent for the Chicago Tribune who also covers health care issues. Prior to this assignment, her work concentrated on economic issues. She joined the newspaper in March, 1987.

Before joining the Tribune, Povich was employed by United Press International for 12 years, the last nine in Washington. She was most recently UPI's Capitol Hill reporter.

Povich is the recipient of the 1989 Women in Communications 'Clarion' award for her story on the impact of the most recent stock market crash on the Chicago markets and on federal regulation of those markets.

Povich served on the board of the former Washington Press Club and is the immediate past President of the Washington Press Club Foundation, a non-profit organization which promotes journalistic history and issues.

Born in Bath, Maine, she was graduated from Cornell University with a B.A. in English. While at Cornell, Povich was awarded a

Newspaper Fund Scholarship and participated in the Fund's internship program. She joined UPI in Jackson, Mississippi in 1975.

Povich is married to Ronald Dziengiel, a manager with Westinghouse Electric Co., and lives in Laurel, Maryland. They have one child, Mark Dziengiel, age 3.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Pursuant to a previous announcement, the Chair will announce this will be the last 1-minute until the end of the day.

TERM LIMITS: AN IDEA WHOSE TIME HAS COME

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, term limits for Members of Congress is an idea whose time has come. We have seen 22 States attempt to limit the membership in this body by statutory law within their States. Those limitations have ranged from 6 years to 12 years, with variations in between.

□ 1050

We have seen constitutional amendments proposed in this body that likewise range from 6 years to 12 years with variations in between.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I, along with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MINGE], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MEEHAN], and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], have introduced a proposed constitutional amendment that would set an outward boundary of 12 years for membership in both this body and the body across the way. But it also has the unique provision of allowing States the authority by statute to set any limitation less than that that they choose.

I say to my colleagues: If you believe in States rights, if you believe in federalism, if you believe in term limits that allow States flexibility, I would urge you to join with us in cosponsoring this constitutional amendment.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHUSTER). Without objection and pursuant to the provisions of sections 5580 and 5581 of the revised statutes, 20 U.S.C. 42-43, the Chair, on behalf of the Speaker, appoints as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members on the part of the House:

Mr. LIVINGSTON of Louisiana, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. MINETA of California.

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 43, TO PERMIT COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN TO SCHEDULE HEARINGS

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-6) on the resolution (H. Res. 47) providing for the consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 43) to amend clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI to permit committee chairmen to schedule hearings, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AMENDING HOUSE RULES TO PERMIT COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN TO SCHEDULE HEARINGS

Mr. SOLOMON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-5) on the resolution (H. Res. 43) to amend clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI to permit committee chairmen to schedule hearings, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

UNFUNDED MANDATE REFORM ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 38 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5.

□ 1052

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5) to curb the practice of imposing unfunded Federal mandates on States and local governments, to ensure that the Federal Government pays the costs incurred by those governments in complying with certain requirements under Federal statutes and regulations, and to provide information on the cost of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, with Mr. EMERSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Tuesday, January 24, 1995, the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] has been disposed of, and section 4 was open for amendment at any point.

Are their further amendments to section 4?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD].

MEDICARE

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to challenge my colleagues not to

forget about a constituency of this Nation that looks to us to fulfill our obligation to them. This obligation is the preservation of the Medicare program. All of us, as citizens, owe a debt to those who have come before us, our senior citizens, and made this country what it is, and we must not sacrifice their needs to pay for our excesses. Passing a balanced budget constitutional amendment without specifying where the target cuts are will tie our hands as a Congress and jeopardize the fulfillment of our pledges to the senior citizens of this Nation. We have pledged to take care of the elderly and the infirm so that they and their families will not have to shoulder the burden of their illnesses alone.

We must remember those persons who have entrusted us with this trust. We must not forsake them when they need us most. It is our duty to preserve this fund and protect those who are under our care. I ask the U.S. Senate and the President not to forsake them.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know that Members are happy and excited at the prospect that we are going to be dealing with unfunded mandates again today. A little Friday morning sarcasm, Mr. Chairman, because I really expect that the reverse is actually the case. We are hearing on both sides of the aisle that there is hope that we can come to a conclusion on this very important legislation, so I sense the reverse is true, and I would ask my colleagues, "Who else really wants to see an end to this process?" That would be the Nation's Governors, both Republicans and Democrats; the Nation's mayors, again both Republicans and Democrats; the Nation's county commissioners, the Nation's township supervisors, both Republicans and Democrats who really want to see this bill moved through the process.

They are faced with some very hard choices, Mr. Chairman. They have to, in many cases, decide whether to continue or reduce a very vital local program in order to carry out a Federal mandate that is imposed upon them from here in Washington, and I must say, Mr. Chairman, that the passage of the balanced budget amendment last evening makes this an even more urgent requirement. They are going to need relief from the unfunded mandates situation because their concern is with the balanced budget amendment we may just accelerate our ability, our wish, to pass through requirements that we are not going to be able to fund because of the balanced budget amendment.

So, it is the local mayors, Governors and so forth, that are really crying out for this legislation, and quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, in talking with the