

just simply cannot attach any probability or likelihood to it at this time until I have further discussion with other relevant people.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader indicate to us when we will be able to begin the process of analysis and numbers crunching on the Medicare provisions that will be a central part of reconciliation? Perhaps the gentleman could update us on when reconciliation is expected to come to the floor, and when we will be able to begin the process of understanding the full impact of those cuts in the Medicare Program that are obviously going to be very contentious and need a great deal of attention before we should be in a position to vote on them.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, again I thank the gentleman for asking. It is a little difficult to tell right now. We hope to complete our work. We have had a lot of people working very diligently on Medicare, and of course all the other work that is being done on reconciliation. We should begin to start seeing some of the fruits of the labor maybe as early as the end of next week, but I would say it would probably be somewhere closer to the end of September before we could really have defining work out here for us to examine.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, could the gentleman tell us when we anticipate reconciliation being brought to the floor? Has that been agreed to finally?

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will again yield, I think once we get into the period of time where we have some very important recesses necessary for the Jewish holidays, that as we try to work our way around that, we might anticipate it would be perhaps the week before or the week following those Jewish holidays recess.

Mr. FAZIO of California. There is no intent to change our current schedule that has been announced and disseminated to Members on either Jewish holidays or the Columbus Day break?

Mr. ARMEY. I really appreciate the gentleman asking. Everybody should have a printed schedule in the form of calendars, and those dates for when the week begins and where it ends, and what days are off because of the holidays, those are firm. There would be no changes in there except possibly, should things go well on floor action, we might every now and then be able to have a pleasant surprise and get out a little earlier or maybe have an extra day to spend in our districts, but there would be no days in addition to those that are already in the schedule for the Members.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's reassurance. I am sure the Members appreciate that. We would look forward to only pleasant surprises, and no unhappy eventualities that might set us back.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure the gentleman realizes, or maybe does not realize he misspoke earlier, but Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I want to encourage the gentleman to appreciate the fact that we do not intend to see any package in which there will be Medicare cuts.

Mr. FAZIO of California. I was wondering if the gentleman might not have caught that. Reductions in the rate of increase, is that the jargon?

Mr. ARMEY. I would like to think of it as a generous increase.

Mr. FAZIO of California. For those who note the aging of America and the increasing population of the aged and the often double digit increases in the cost of health care, perhaps this is a much more important debate than simply a semantic one. We can hold that for the eventual introduction of the Medicare increase reductions.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, September 12, for morning hour debate.

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

There was no objection.

#### DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the 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 Texas?

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 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 Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. SCHROEDER 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 Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. MCINTOSH 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 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 Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday the House considered the fiscal year 1996 legislative appropriations bill and I do agree that the House has to take a serious look at its own fiscal affairs. However, I would like to comment on a matter that relates to the daily operation of the House and does not make financial sense.

Last week, the House folding room and all of its related operations were closed. This decision was made under the guise of streamlining and reform. However, it is nothing more than a mean-spirited, poorly conceived, and fiscally irresponsible action. It is truly reform for the sake of reform.

I applaud the House Oversight Committee in its efforts to change the way that the House does business. I was elected to Congress to help to restore the public's faith in this institution. However, by trying to save money in closing the folding room, the committee has created a bookkeeping nightmare and as Members search for new vendors to serve the printing and mailing needs of their constituents, the total franking and overall costs to the taxpayer will probably increase.

Our constituents need and deserve to be well informed about the issues that affect them. Bulk mailings and newsletters are an essential part of our jobs and voters expect to have a clear line of communications to their representatives in Washington. Certainly, a responsible use of these mailing privileges is expected; nevertheless, by closing the folding room another barrier has been created between Washington and the rest of the country.

Why were other remedies related to the House operation of a folding room not considered further? An outside company could have been brought in to run the day-to-day operations of the folding room. As it now stands, congressional staffs now have to scramble to find new vendors and much of their productivity is wasted as they endeavor to fold, stuff, and seal hundreds of pieces of normal correspondence that they churn out on a daily basis. And the job is not done well. I know of a recent bulk mailing that was improperly handled by an outside vendor and because of this precious time and money was lost.

Without the folding room, the House is a more confused and inefficient operation. Is this what the American people voted for in the last election?

And, there is a very important moral issue at play. Over 100 people lost their jobs when the folding room was abruptly shut down. Many of these people were loyal employees of the House with over 20 years of faithful service. I believe that the treatment of the folding room staff was wrong. I am very distrustful that many are starting to believe that the House is the last plantation. If the labor laws of America are to be applied to Congress, then the employees of the House should be treated with at least minimum levels of respect and decency.

I want Congress to be efficient and mindful of the taxpayers' money. However, by closing the folding room, the total money spent by the House will most likely increase, constituent service will be slowed, and the House will appear to be even more out of touch. The Oversight Committee's action are well intentioned, but poorly implemented. The House may find that it needs to look at this issue again.

#### REAUTHORIZATION OF THE RYAN WHITE CARE ACT

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is fast approaching the time in this country when we will reauthorize a very important health care act known as the Ryan White Care Act. This act does tremendous amounts of good in terms of offering health care for those afflicted with this dreadful disease.

We owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN] for his efforts to raise the awareness of this body, as well as this country, as to the former testing practices of the CDC, and we also owe a debt of gratitude to him for making us aware of the failed policies of the ethicists that have advised the CDC, for over this past year we have been blindly testing mothers and children for this disease, without their knowledge, and when finding positive cases we have refused to identify those positive cases and offer treatment for both newborn children and their mothers, this all at the advice of a group of ethicists that told our CDC that this was an appropriate practice.

The other disturbing thing about that is that the CDC thought it was an appropriate practice, that newborn children infected with a deadly virus and knowledge of that by our own Centers for Disease Control should not have the opportunity for the best treatment that we have available, and also their mothers should not have the knowledge or opportunity that they in fact could be treated, their quality of life could be prolonged, and complications arising from this disease could be prevented.

That, however, has not been the full story of what has happened. Because of

the awareness that has come to light through the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ACKERMAN], we will be proposing, with the new Ryan White authorization, an opportunity for children to have a future.

□ 1245

There is no place today where we have and can make an impact on the HIV epidemic in this country like that associated with women of reproductive age. Today the fastest growing segment in this epidemic is women in the reproductive age category. It is growing 8 times faster in this group than in any other group in our country.

We also have the opportunity to truly impact newborn babies, because now we have a treatment that prevents, two-thirds of the time, infection in the baby from a woman who might be carrying the HIV virus.

The opportunity that will be coming before us will be shadowed in many debates, a debate on confidentiality, a debate on the rights of women not to be tested, but the ultimate debate that will come about as we reauthorize Ryan White will be the debate of how we have handled this epidemic in our country. In 1981, the first case was diagnosed, and today we have 2.5 million people in our country with this virus. We should ask if we are proud of the job that this country has done in facing this disease, in the way that our Government agencies have handled the epidemic and their approach to it.

But, most importantly, where we have an opportunity to make a difference, to prevent infection in newborn children, we should not shrink back from that. We should stand up and make the difference, the difference that not only will save several thousand babies' lives each year but also, in this time of scarce resources, will add a quarter of a billion dollars in saved health care costs just from testing mothers during their first trimester of pregnancy.

It is my hope and my wish that we will step aside from the politically correct positions of our country and look at the real harm that this infection has caused, not to make callous judgments on those who have unfortunately acquired this disease but all work together to make a new and improved effort at making a difference, saving lives and controlling this epidemic.

#### INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 2265, MOTOR SPORTS PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday I introduced H.R. 2265, the Motor Sports Protection Act to meet the threat to professional auto racing posed by Bill Clinton's assault on tobacco.

If tobacco companies are forced to remove their sponsorship of racing the very existence of NASCAR, NHRA, and formula one is in doubt. NASCAR alone is a \$2-billion industry. An advertising ban will put thousands of Americans out of work.

Richard Petty the king of racing noted: "That all race fans can rally around this bill and I want to help stop Big Brother from attacking law abiding, family oriented, hard working citizens who enjoy racing." Mr. Speaker, this is not about tobacco alone. It is about whether we will stand up and fight another blatant power grab by the Federal Government. We must draw the line against bureaucratic meddling with this wholesome, all-American sport. H.R. 2265, is the first step in our fight to win back Government for our people. Please join the effort and help save racing.

#### THE BALANCED-BUDGET MYTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to preliminarily begin with some general remarks and then as I go into my allotted time, I will be more specific in the issue that I feel is in urgent need to be discussed.

The reason I wanted to have some preliminary remarks by way of explanation is that this period set aside that we designate as special orders is a very interesting one with a very interesting history in which I am very proud of the role I played in developing it into an accepted and formal part of the procedures.

In the beginning of my career here in the House, which of course spans quite a number of years going back to 1961, it was not the custom to practice what we call today special orders. It was looked upon as a quite radical if not an unaccustomed practice, and the procedure was very, very formal, very standardized, and allowed for no real participation even during the general consideration of the full House for any but the very few selected leaders who exercised total power at that time.

Well, of course, that is a long time ago. Those of us who have managed to span these years have noticed, with some gratification, the changes since that rather straitjacketed and quite sterile period of time. Of course in the interim the country has literally been shaken to root and marrow with some very, very substantial issues and developments that have engulfed it, not because there were issues born spontaneously from within our country, but as the work shrunk and the United States after the war became an inescapable even though quite reluctant leader of