

and deposit insurance funds? What about regulating the generation, transportation, storage and disposal of toxic, hazardous, and radioactive substances? Without a Federal standard, can each State set its own guidelines for waste disposal, and be free to unload its waste on another? Will this bill threaten water safety regulations? Are those protections that we have worked so long and hard to put in place at risk of being erased? I support the concept of mandate reform, but I have serious problems with this process—the way in which we are forcing this bill through. Its long-term impact is too great and too far reaching to be sacrificed for a short-lived success.

I am voting in favor of final passage of H.R. 5 in support of the communities in my district that have consistently expressed their frustration and concern with underfunded mandates. However, I also want to go on record noting my concerns with mandates reform that moves too quickly and does not take into consideration its far-reaching impact. H.R. 5 must ensure that State and local governments get the help that they need in meeting the financial costs of complying with Federal regulations. But it must also reflect the fact that we must have Federal standards. There are certain protections that cannot be waived or eroded. We must therefore work together to develop legislation that balances our support of these critical protections with consideration for the State and local governments that bear the burden of their implementation.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BREUTER) having assumed the chair, Mr. EMERSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration 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 costs of Federal mandates on the private sector, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 101, TAOS PUEBLO INDIANS OF NEW MEXICO LAND TRANSFER

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-12) on the resolution (H. Res. 51) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 101) to transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 400, THE ANAKTUVUK PASS LAND EXCHANGE AND WILDERNESS REDESIGNATION ACT OF 1995

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-13) on the resolution (H. Res. 52) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 400) to provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 440, LAND CONVEYANCE IN BUTTE COUNTY, CA

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-14) on the resolution (H. Res. 53) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 440) to provide for the conveyance of lands to contain individuals in Butte County, CA, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Agriculture; Economic and Educational Opportunities; Transportation and Infrastructure; Judiciary; Science; Resources; Commerce; and International Relations.

It is my understanding that the minority has been consulted and that there is no object to these requests.

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object and I will not object, the minority is not going to object but simply say to the Members of the majority, the distinguished majority leader, that this is certainly the appropriate way to go about this. I think we have had a very fruitful day today, we moved quickly through the bill. In each of the cases, the eight committees that the distinguished majority leader mentioned, there was full consultation with the minority. Everyone signed off on it. We think this is the way to operate. We look forward to operating in this way in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

GRIDLOCK

(Mrs. SEASTRAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, when I was elected to this great body just 3 short months ago, I made a commitment to my constituents to fight diligently for the ideas that I believe in and to be just as unrelenting in my fight against those ideas that are not good for my district, my State, and our country.

But I must say that I find the behavior by some Members on the other side of the aisle a bit bizarre. They fight to stall legislation that they eventually vote to pass.

I have maintained that gridlock is not necessarily a bad situation. If you oppose something, try to defeat it with every weapon at your disposal. But when a group purposely stalls a bill simply for partisan gain, that is pretense without principle. Some of the antics on the other side of the aisle make you wonder who is devising their strategy.

We are working for real change. We kept our promises by passing the balanced budget amendment last week and are working this week to pass the unfunded mandates bill that will stop the Federal Government from not only passing the buck, but passing the bill to our States and localities.

Mr. Speaker, we should stop the delaying tactics. The American people want us to end the bickering and go on about the people's business.

□ 1940

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BREWSTER) laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 30, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for testimony and documents concerning constituent casework. The subpoena was issued by the Superior Court of New Jersey in Morris County.

After consultation with General Counsel, I will determine if compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,
RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
Member of Congress.

SERIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT AUTHORITY UNDER WHICH ACTION WAS TAKEN TO BAIL OUT THE MEXICAN PESO

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

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, today we heard communications from the White House, which were communicated and reverberated around the world, that the President of the United States has made an end run around the Congress, and I think this raises some very troubling problems about the Mexican bailout process.

Just 1 short week ago, Mr. Speaker, we had the top administration officials appear before the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, on which I have the honor of serving, to tell this Congress that the only way, the only way that we could avoid a crisis in the international monetary market and avoid a collapse of the Mexican economy, is if this Congress acceded to the wishes of the administration and provided legislation that would in effect bail out the Mexican peso.

Less than 1 week later, Mr. Speaker, we find out that the administration has another plan, and I call on the administration to come clean with this Congress, to let us know exactly what is going on and to answer some very serious questions about the authority under which this action is taking place, why it was not foreseen and why this administration, through the testimony of the administration officials in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, appeared to mislead this U.S. Congress and the American people.

BIPARTISANSHIP PREVAILS

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, last week, when we passed the balanced budget amendment, we took a good step not only toward fulfilling campaign promises, but also for working with each other as Democrats and Republicans because there are about 70 to 80 Democrats who voted on the balanced budget amendment and joined the Republican majority. I think that is a great bipartisan effort. The same thing has happened as we debate the unfunded mandates bill. Many Democrats are not going along with this obstructionism. They are coming over to the majority side and putting the business of the American people first.

During the month of February, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be debating the line-item veto, and the crime bill and regulatory reform. All these are very, very important to our constituents, Democrats, Republicans, big cities, small cities, rural, urban, and I hope that this bipartisan spirit prevails so that we can take care of the business that America demands and do what is best for our great country.

PRESIDENT SHOWS HIGH DEGREE OF LEADERSHIP BY HELPING MEXICO STABILIZE ITS ECONOMY THROUGH GUARANTEED LOANS

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

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I think that today's action by the President of the United States in taking his prerogative as a Chief Executive to order an Executive order guaranteeing the \$47.5 billion guarantees to Mexico was a prudent move. I believe it sends out a strong signal to the international markets, to the international community, that he is showing a high degree of leadership. Since we in Congress were not able to meet his request, I believe that the President is taking his prerogatives as the Chief Executive to order those guaranteed loans which will go a long way in seeing to it that the Mexican peso is stabilized, that the economy of Mexico can be stabilized, for not to do so would have a serious negative impact on American workers and on our relationships with that country, not to speak of the problems that it would cause as a domino effect in Brazil, and Argentina and other developing nations.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that today's move by President Clinton was an important one and indicates once again that he is willing to make tough decisions in a crisis time like this.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BREWSTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

CIRCUMVENTING THE WILL OF CONGRESS

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today the Clinton administration abandoned its effort to pass a \$40 billion loan guarantee to Mexico. The President came to the conclusion that his bailout proposal would have failed in Congress, and he was right.

So what does the administration turn around and do? Instead of really responding to the opposition of Congress, the administration decides to devise a new plan, a new plan which effectively circumvents the will of the Congress. While this new plan includes more international financial support, it also calls for dipping into our country's exchange equalization fund for as much

as \$20 billion to prop up the peso. This fund, which only holds \$25 billion, I might add, is usually only used to help stabilize the U.S. dollar.

Mr. Speaker, this marks the first time that the fund has ever been used to support any kind of currency other than the U.S. dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I must take exception. I must take exception to how this administration wants to put the Mexican peso before the American people. I must take exception to how this administration chooses to sidestep the authority of Congress in this matter.

Even with International Monetary Fund support, U.S. tax dollars are still at risk. By avoiding the authority of the U.S. Congress the administration does not have to answer to the elected Representatives of the American people on this rescue plan for Mexico.

How did we come to where we are today? Well Mr. Speaker, it all began with something called NAFTA. Over a year ago, the media hailed it as the right thing to do.

□ 1950

Meanwhile, the Clinton administration cut deals with various Members in exchange for their vote in favor of the agreement. I and others, however, stood our ground and said "no" to NAFTA. We did so knowing full well the devastating effects such an agreement would have on the U.S. work force and our country's trade position. Unfortunately, our warnings went unheeded, and today the administration wants to bail out Mexico.

The Clinton administration promised that 100,000 new jobs would be created in the first year of NAFTA. These jobs we have yet to see. Let us take a look at the statistics. Since NAFTA was enacted, United States net imports with Mexico fell more than half. Our trade deficit in electronics has doubled, and we have a \$12 billion trade deficit in automobiles and parts. In fact, the overall automotive trade deficit with Mexico has only worsened under NAFTA.

The Department of Commerce estimated that \$1 billion in exports supports approximately 20,000 jobs. This means our automotive trade deficit alone has cost our country 32,000 jobs. So how are U.S. workers expected to deal with this? NAFTA's trade adjustment assistance program certainly is not helping, because eligibility requirements are extremely strict and the actual benefits are limited. Many firms have actually consulted their employees and told them not to bother applying.

Labor and environmental side agreements negotiated under NAFTA have proven to be abused.

Now after a year of NAFTA, Mexico has experienced a financial crisis, and Americans, thousands of whom lost their jobs to Mexico, are being asked to foot the bill. Americans are being forced to prop up the peso through a