

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE
SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 4. An act to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 4) "An Act to restore the American family, reduce illegitimacy, control welfare spending and reduce welfare dependence" and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

RADICAL LEGISLATIVE CHANGES
ON HORIZON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUNN of Oregon). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of some colleagues of mine who were here earlier speaking about the Medicare cuts and the Medicaid cuts. Nothing is more important now on the legislative agenda than the rape of Medicare and Medicaid.

Many people have focused on Medicare and do not even know that Medicaid is being cut even more drastically than Medicare. Medicaid is being cut by \$180 billion over a 7-year period. But it is a smaller program and the percentage of the cut is much greater.

Of even greater significance than that is the fact that there are proposals on the table to eliminate the entitlement for Medicaid. Medicaid at present offers a means-tested entitlement. That is, if you can prove that you are poor and needy, then you qualify for Medicaid if you are in the category which on the basis of this means-testing process makes you eligible.

This means-tested entitlement, as we call it, is now on the chopping block. It is being proposed that it be eliminated.

We have a precedent that has been set in the last few days. We have witnessed the Senate follow the pattern of the House and eliminate the entitlement for AFDC, Aid to Families with Dependent Children. That is welfare mothers in popular terms.

Welfare mothers, welfare families, welfare children, under the law that has existed since the Social Security laws were enacted, under the New Deal, under Franklin Roosevelt, have had an entitlement. That is, if you can prove that you are really in need and you are poor and you qualify under the means-testing, then you are eligible for the benefits of the Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

That is gone now. It is only a matter of the President signing it into law.

The Senate has passed a bill which removes the entitlement. The House had already removed it before. It is a barbaric act.

I have used the word "barbaric" before. I have defined barbarians as those who have no compassion. Many barbarians have a great deal of education but they have no compassion.

When I use the word "barbarian," I do not refer to religion. I do not care which religion or which denomination they belong to. If they have no compassion for anyone except their own kind and kin, then they are barbarians. They are incapable of having compassion.

Barbarians are a threat to society, especially when barbarians have power. When barbarians are able to make decisions and they do not have any compassion, they are a threat to any society. They are a threat to America, because they are making these horrendous cuts and taking away entitlements like the entitlement of a needy child to help from their Government.

They are threatening to take away the entitlement from Medicaid, the entitlement of a person who is sick or families who are in need of medical attention and are unable to pay for that medical attention themselves. They are going to take it away.

They are going to leave the elderly out on the hillside to die, in symbolic terms, because when you cut Medicaid and you take away the Medicaid entitlement, what you are doing is cutting nursing home care, because two-thirds of Medicaid goes to nursing home care and care for people with disabilities. Two-thirds. One-third is for families who are poor, but two-thirds goes for nursing home care for the elderly and for people with disabilities. So you are going to take away the nursing home care from the elderly people when you remove that entitlement.

The Federal Government is going to get out of the responsibility of promoting the general welfare in that respect and leave it all up to the States who would not do it before. Before we had Medicaid, they would not do it. Before we had Medicare, the States would not do it. So there is no reason to believe the States are going to take up that burden once the Federal Government gives them that responsibility and slowly the amount of money made available by the Federal Government is decreased.

I want to loan any support and certainly associate myself with the remarks of my colleagues who spoke earlier about this problem of Medicare and Medicaid being number one on our agenda. Everybody has to be concerned about it. It is a snapshot of our civilization.

Where are we in America right now? If the American people sit still and allow this to happen, where are we? If we allow coverage for health care to instead of going forward to become universal coverage as we were discussing just a year ago, just a year ago we had

plans on the table to move forward universal health care coverage, where eventually 95 percent, at least, of all the people in America would be covered with some kind of health care plan. Now instead of moving forward, we are going to take away the coverage which is already guaranteed to people who are eligible for Medicaid and move backwards.

There will be many fewer Americans who are covered with any kind of health care plan after this Medicaid entitlement is removed. That is a great step backwards, and the American people must focus in and take a close look at who are we, what are we, where are we?

Are we so desperate that we have to act as barbarians? Are we so desperate that we have to sit by as the voters and the citizens and approve of such barbaric acts? Are we going to swallow the arguments that we are on the verge of bankruptcy and there is no other way to get out of this threat of bankruptcy except to do mean and extreme things to each other, to the least among us, those who are unable to help themselves?

Please try to stay with it, because the pace of change over the next 3 or 4 weeks will be quite rapid. Next week we will have a week off, but the pace goes forward even though the Congress will not be in session, because the negotiations now on the appropriations bills, the negotiations and the details of the health care plans and Medicaid, the welfare reform, a number of things are happening, and they will go forward even while Congress is not in session next week.

But once we return, then all other things will have to be wrapped up in a matter of a few weeks and the pace will be mind-boggling. There will be radical legislation changes. We are not just finishing up the first half of the 104th Congress.

The agenda for the 104th Congress requires, because of the way the leaders have structured it, that we pass radical legislative changes before this half of the session ends. That means that in the next 3 or 4 weeks, you are going to have to follow very closely while some very mean and extreme changes are made rapidly. Under the cover of the rapidity, the swiftness with which things are done, much will be lost unless we follow very closely.

We did pass a continuing resolution today. A continuing resolution, I have explained before, is a resolution necessary to keep the Government going when the appropriations bills have not been passed to cover programs and activities of the Government. Most of the appropriations bills have not been passed by both the House and the Senate.

I would like to applaud our leaders in the House, our leaders in the Senate and our leaders at the White House for not indulging in melodrama. We did not have any melodramatic showdown

at this point. Because to have any attempt to stop the Government or even pretend to stop the Government at this point would be ridiculous.

There is so much to be done, there are so many appropriations bills that have not been passed by the Senate. There is so much, it would be ridiculous to pretend that we could stay here over the weekend or work out some kind of solution in such a short period of time. There will be still a problem later on. We have expanded it until November 13, I think, and the continuing resolution ends on November 13.

The train wreck that has been talked about, the train wreck that is coming will definitely occur at that time, I assure you. There will be a clash between the President and the Republican-controlled Congress, because the President says he will not accept certain bills. He has made it quite clear. On some he says he may not accept them, but on one or two he has said he will not accept certain appropriations bills.

One of them is the human services, education and job training appropriation bill. If it comes out of the Senate and comes out of the conference process and looks the way the bill looks in the House, with \$4 billion in education cuts and \$5 billion in job training and human services cuts, then the President has made it quite clear he will not sign the bill, he will veto it.

Probably he will veto a Medicare bill which is as outrageous as those that are being proposed. I hope the President will shortly, in the next few days, make a clear statement that he will veto any bill which ends the entitlement for Medicaid.

We have lost the entitlement for Aid to Families with Dependent Children. We have lost the entitlement for people who are poor and are in need of assistance. It is lost. Overwhelmingly the Democrats joined the Republicans to vote for it in the Senate. They can never override in Presidential veto. The power of the actions of the Senate has come back to influence the people in the House. It is a lost cause.

The House stood up firmly. Democrats in the House stood firmly on the principle of entitlement. I congratulate my Democratic colleagues, the conservatives, the liberals. Everybody got together on the bill that we offered as a substitute.

We offered a substitute bill which would have provided job training, would have provided a longer time for people to be educated and get job training. It would have provided some kind of program to help create jobs. In addition to that, most important, the bill that was offered by the Democrats on the floor of the House at the time of the welfare reform bill consideration kept the Federal entitlement. The Federal Government stands behind individuals who are in need. The Federal Government stands behind individuals who are in need when a hurricane happens. We take it for granted. It is not written in the legislation that automati-

cally you will get Federal aid; it is going to be there no matter how rich you are. If your house is blown down by the winds, no matter how many times you build your house in a place where the winds are likely to blow it down, when they come again, you will get Federal help. When floods occur, no matter how close you build your home to the river, no matter how many times you keep building your home close to the river, no matter how well-off you are, when floods occur, you are going to continue to get help from the Federal Government. Earthquakes, \$7 billion, \$8 billion for the California earthquake. You can expect, regardless of the state of a person's income, everybody who is affected by the earthquake will get some help from the Government.

That is a civilized government. That is a government designed to promote the general welfare. That is the way it should be. But it should also be that way for people who have economic difficulties and need help.

Oh, yes, there are abuses in the welfare program. There are abuses in the earthquake relief program. Have you heard? There are abuses in the flood relief program. There are abuses in programs that relieve hurricanes and tornados. Wherever human beings exist, they promulgate abuses of programs. Some people take advantage of the situation. There are going to be abuses.

I am going to talk in a few minutes about two sets of abuses, abuses that are in the welfare reform program that enrage so many citizens and abuses that took place in the savings-and-loans program, which seem to be forgotten already although they cost more than \$250 billion. That is a most conservative estimate. I will make a comparison in a few minutes.

Before I do that, I just want to end my alert on Medicare and Medicaid. American people, please, keep your eyes on Medicaid and the Medicaid entitlement. Do not let the Medicaid entitlement be wiped away. We can only mourn now for the entitlement for poor people, public assistance, and only mourn now for the entitlement for children, dependent children. We can only mourn because it is almost all over. The agreement has been reached. There is very little we can do politically to roll back the clock and to gather the forces necessary to maintain an entitlement that was instituted by the Social Security Act under Franklin Roosevelt. We cannot bring it back.

But we can stop the escalation of the barbarity. We can stop the barbarians from taking away the Medicaid entitlement. We can act. Let your Congressman know. Let your Senators know. Let everybody know you do not want to move further away from universal health care. The thing that brings us closest to health care for poor people is the Medicaid Program. You do not want to take health care away from seniors who, after they exhaust their

income, they exhaust whatever assets they have, go from Medicare to Medicaid. You do not want to do that. Too many of our senior citizens would be left on the hillside to die, in symbolic terms.

Let us move for a minute to take a look at the fact that Americans are outraged by abuses in welfare and the welfare reform has certainly been in response to some ridiculous kinds of things that have occurred. I would criticize the social work profession. I would criticize the public policy planners for allowing a lot of little things that could have been corrected to mushroom. But I assure you that welfare, as a system, is far more honest, the system for providing public subsidy to children who are dependent is far better run and far more honest than most Federal programs that exist today. Let me repeat that: There are abuses in any program that has ever been conceived by the Federal Government, State government, or local Government, and any government, any programs that have been conceived of by any government anywhere in the world. The human mind is such that there are people who can move in and begin to find places to take advantage of the system. The abuses are inevitable because of the fact that human beings are so intelligent and some of them who are very intelligent are not at all honest. There is always the guy who is looking, the hustler who is looking for a way to take advantage of the system.

So welfare has had its abuses. The abuses, again, are minuscule compared to the abuses that we have seen in some other programs.

Let me just stop for a moment and read a couple of clippings to you. Let me just stop for a moment and take advantage of some recent developments which you might have missed. You might have missed the fact that in the New York Times, on September 25, and many other papers in the last few days, there has been a big discussion of the fact that the CIA had more than \$1.5 billion. I know these numbers lose you. You know, you think in millions, and hundreds of millions, but when you get to billions, people just cannot understand a billion dollars and what you can do with that. You know, a billion dollars, I assure you, would pay for a lot of nursing home time for hundreds of thousands of people. A billion dollars would cover a lot of food for a lot of school lunch programs. A billion dollars is a lot of money.

The school program, lunch program, was cut by about \$2 billion over a period of 7 years. We could give back that \$2 billion and say:

School lunch program, you don't have to worry about searching out the immigrant children. You don't have to worry about driving out the immigrants, legal immigrant children, by the way. You do not have to worry about looking for the illegal ones. You do now have to deal with these draconian cuts that are going to be squeezed as you move the program down to the State level

and cut back on the amount of funds, because you have a \$1.5 billion windfall here in the CIA.

The CIA has secreted. They have so much money and there are so many abuses, and the administration is so loose and so lax until \$1.5 billion was secreted away in a slush fund without the Members of Congress being informed. The heads of the agency, the agency heads, the people in charge said that they did not know about it. The President, the White House, they did not know about it; \$1.5 billion. Put that down. You know, that is an estimate of the New York Times. It is secret, of course. It probably was more, but it is a secret figure. The conservative estimate is \$1.5 billion.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to do is demonstrate that there are widespread and very costly abuses throughout the Government. There are many at the city level and State level which never get the visibility that Federal programs get. But occasionally there are some secret programs in the Federal Government, like the CIA slush fund that I am talking about.

They discovered \$1.5 billion in a slush fund that nobody knew about except, I guess, the people who keep the money. I mean, how can they not know? How did it not show up on the books? What welfare recipient could ever get away with a few hundred dollars not showing up in the system? Here we have \$1.5 billion.

What is going to be done as a result of finding that there were people who were keeping \$1.5 billion or more out of the reach of their supervisors and out of the reach of Congress and the President? What is being done? Excuses are being made. All kinds of excuses are being made.

Now, this is in an agency which has been guilty before, ladies and gentlemen. This is the spy satellite agency. You know, in popular terms, this is the Nation's spy satellite agency. It is the National Reconnaissance Office. The National Reconnaissance Office was cited, you know, not too many months ago for having a building under construction which cost \$317 million, more than \$3 million. This was a building under construction for more than, and I have it here, \$347 million last year. Last year, Senators said they were surprised to find the agency had built a new headquarters in northern Virginia near Dulles International Airport. The Senators of the United States were surprised that a whole building had been built, a new headquarters in northern Virginia near Dulles International Airport. You cannot hide a building, and you certainly cannot hide a building next to the airport, I guess, unless you are the CIA. But the Senators were surprised to find that \$347 million had been used to build a building.

But \$347 million had been concealed in accounts that did not appear to be for construction. The agency said it has been negligent. "Oh, we are sorry, Mr. Senator, we are sorry, Mr. Rep-

resentative, but we have been a little negligent. We had this \$347 million, and we built a building, and you did not see it."

Now the same agency is discovered to have an additional hidden amount of \$1.5 billion or more, and they are saying the same thing. "We are sorry, you, we are a little loose." Excuses are being made because these are white middle-class males. Excuses are being made. They can be sloppy. They can waste your money. They are not welfare children. They are not welfare mothers, who most people think are black or Latino, although the statistics will show that there are more whites on welfare.

The racism that creeps into the outrage about welfare will not here, because, after all, these are educated people, very well educated. If you can hide the building of a building next to an airport, you are a genius. It takes a whole set of geniuses to build a building next to an airport and, you know, Dulles is here in the Capital. It is in the Washington area, and the Senators not see it, not know about it, the Representatives not know about it, the White House not know about it. These are geniuses who have misspent \$1.5 billion or more. They are geniuses, but barbarians in the sense that they have no qualms, no conscience, to say, "Look, we did not use this money, you can have it back, and you can use it to cover some Medicaid costs in the nursing homes or you can use it to cover some food stamp costs, you can use it to cover some earthquake victims' costs, some flood victim costs."

No. They have kept the money and, fortunately, something happened that it was discovered. This is the same agency that so mismanaged and blundered so much that they had a man named Aldrich Ames in there for years in charge of the spy operation in Eastern Europe and Russia, and he was a spy for Russia, for the Soviet Union. Aldrich Ames is his name.

Aldrich Ames grew up in the CIA culture. His father was in the CIA before him. Aldrich Ames was an alcoholic. Aldrich Ames was a guy who took his girlfriend to the safe houses of the CIA against regulations. Regulations, you know, we have got family values in the regulations, but he violated that. He violated all of the operating principles of the agency, and yet he was promoted again and again, and he caused the death of at least 10 people working for the CIA, according to official count, caused their deaths.

My point is, I do not want to dwell too much on this, my point is here is a blundering, deadly agency of the Federal Government, and all they get are raps on the knuckles. This is a very poisonous agency that causes life and death in large numbers. This is the agency which labeled Jean-Bertrand Aristide as a psychopath. This is the agency which gave money to the group in Haiti that was fighting against the United States Government's effort to

reach a peaceful solution in Haiti. This is the CIA.

The CIA budget, we do not even know what it is, but we can go on the floor and propose to cut it, whatever it is. We wanted to cut it by 10 percent. The estimates by the New York Times and those media groups that are able to get good information, the estimate was that it was a \$28 billion operation, and we looked forward to a 10-percent cut, which would have produced \$2.8 billion that could have been put into education, college Pell grants. You know, we are cutting all over the place.

□ 1945

You know we are cutting all over the place. You have heard my colleagues before on the other side of the aisle talk about Government waste must go. Well, let us not continue to cover up where the real waste is. Let us not join the barbarians. Let us cut, I say cut.

Ten percent of the CIA would have produced at least \$2.8 billion per year. We want to cut it 10 percent for 5 years so that you would cut the agency down to about half the size, and this made sense. But on the floor of the House we have produced this bill three times, and each time we get fewer votes from the Members of the House of Representatives.

Do they want to streamline Government? Do they want to cut waste? Do we want to balance the budget by the year 2002?

No. We want to terrorize the poor. We want to go after the blacks. We want to go after the Latinos. We want to demonstrate that this Government does not exist for certain people. We want to throw certain groups overboard and produce a situation where only the elite can survive. Otherwise why do we not go after an obviously blundering dangerous agency and do to it what we have done to the welfare program? Radical reform; they need radical reform.

The radical and extreme reform that took place with respect to welfare was not necessary. Reform was necessary. In fact, Government should be in the business of reform. We should always be reforming. That is what Government should do, trying to streamline itself, trying to make better use of the taxpayers' money, trying to get greater value. That is what we should be all about. But we are blind when it comes to certain favored groups, certain favored operations.

You think that is an extreme situation? Let us take a look at the article that appeared in the New York Times on September 7 of this year, not too long ago. It is about the old mining law where the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Babbitt, is complaining about the fact that he is powerless to stop some other white males who are educated and rich from taking advantage of the system. Mr. Babbitt is upset. He says his hands are tied by a century-old law which forced him to approve reluctantly the sale of 110 acres of Federal

land in Idaho for \$275. I did not make a mistake, my colleagues, \$275 for 110 acres of land.

Now I would say that \$275 for 110 acres of land is a bargain almost anywhere, you know, even in a swamp. Well, you might hope that 1 day you are going to find something in the swamp that is going to be useful. You got nothing to lose if it only cost you \$275. But this land is estimated to contain a billion, a billion dollars worth, of minerals.

Let me repeat, \$275 for 110 acres of Federal land in Idaho. The land may contain a billion dollars worth of minerals. I am quoting from the New York Times, September 7, 1995. You can go check it out with Mr. Babbitt, the Department of the Interior.

The next paragraph goes on to explain the land was conveyed to Faxcult, a Danish company, under an 1872 law that requires the Government to sell Federal mining rights for as little as \$2.50 an acre. It is an 1872 law that requires the Government to sell Federal mining rights for as little as \$2.50 an acre. Do you hear? It was sold to a Danish company, a foreign company.

Mr. Speaker, they are on the floor bashing immigrants and talking about how terrible it is that immigrants come in and they take jobs and do horrible things. Here we have given away to a foreign country 110 acres of land for \$275, and the estimated mineral yield of that land is a billion dollars.

Now you might say, "Well, it's very generous of us. There's nothing barbaric about that." You know, it is Americans who are compassionate enough to give to foreigners a great gift. Foreigners are not their kind and kin, so, if they are going to give to foreigners, the Danish owners, this kind of bargain, this kind of gift, then that shows that they are not barbaric. These are very generous people. They may be naive, but they are very generous, because, after all, they are giving it away, and they will not gain anything.

Well, life is a bit more complicated than that. Economics is a bit more complicated than that. Business is more complicated than that. Probably no American company thought they could stand up and take the heat from the American people of having gotten away with that kind of deal. So they have gotten a foreign company, but I assure you the people that owned this company are not all Danish. I assure you that the conditions which led to keeping this law would not be there just to benefit a foreign company.

Congress has sought for years to change the law according to the New York Times again. Congress has sought for years to change the law, but under the strong pressure from the mining industry western lawmakers have repeatedly blocked the legislation. Supporters of the law maintain that it helps to promote mining in the United States and preserve jobs. To promote mining

in the United States and preserve jobs you have to give away 110 acres at \$2.75 an acre. Congress has sought for years to change the law under strong pressure, but under strong pressure from the mining industry.

Who is the mining industry? You know, I assure you it is not just this little Danish company, not foreigners. The mining industry has stockholders. The mining industry has very powerful people in very powerful places.

Western lawmakers have repeatedly blocked the legislation.

Western lawmakers? Who are the western lawmakers? They are not foreigners. We do not elect foreigners to office, so western lawmakers, whoever they may be, have blocked legislation which is sought to correct this 1872 law. Probably made sense in 1872 that everybody—you would have to be a fool to believe it made any sense now. Any child can tell you this does not make any sense except if you want to rip off the American people.

Land is owned by the American people until it is conveyed to the mining company, and they say it helps the United States to promote mining in the United States and preserve jobs. If you charged more, you charged a thousand dollars an acre, you cannot promote mining and preserve mining jobs? You know, if it is a billion dollars that is expected, a billion dollars worth of minerals, you certainly could get a higher price.

We are back to that old issue of taxation and revenue. I proposed before that we have a revenue commission, you might recall, a revenue commission to look at ways to get revenue more creatively instead of continuing to tax families and individuals so heavily. You know families and individuals are heavily taxed; 44 percent of our tax burden is borne by families and individuals, and only 11 percent is borne by corporations.

Now these are not the only sources of revenue. There are other kinds of revenue that help make up the total package. When you take a look at some of those other kinds of revenue, we can get revenue from mining lands that are sold, as the President proposes, but here we are up against lawmakers, western lawmakers, who are not insistent, enraged by the fact that somebody is ripping off the Government. No, those are not poor welfare people, one out of every hundred who might be a hustler, who might be taking advantage of the Government programs. These are not people using food stamps who might buy cigarettes for food stamps instead of buying food. These are not those kind of people. These are people who are taking millions of dollars away from the American people that could go into our revenue coffers.

Let me just read on a minute because it is a bit sickening, the whole story, and you can get the flavor of how sick it is by just reading.

The wimpish way we react, the wimpish way our policymakers deal

with these outrageous abuses, is enough to give you a heart attack. It is outrageous.

Quote from the New York Times article:

But Mr. Babbitt, in conveying the Federal tract in Idaho, said he found making such deals, quote, "increasingly distasteful", increasingly distasteful, and he called the law, the law that does this, whose intent originally was to promote development of the West, outdated and exploitative, exploitative, exploitative of taxpayers. Mr. Babbitt found it increasingly distasteful, and he found the law outdated and exploitative of taxpayers.

Now I am not criticizing Mr. Babbitt except I think his language is much too wimpish.

You know, I am reminded of the quote from King Lear. King Lear, after his daughters have betrayed him, said, "Fool me not to bear it tamely. Touch me with noble anger."

Somebody ought to have some noble anger when the CIA secretly has \$1.5 billion stashed away and nobody knows about it. Somebody ought to have noble anger when the CIA can build a building near the airport and the Senators and the Members of Congress do not know about it, and the building costs \$347 million. Somebody ought to be outraged.

They tremble and they shake when they talk about welfare people. You heard them before saying they stand in line, and they get with their food stamps better food than the guy behind them who is working all day. That is outrageous, and they tremble and they shake when they say that, but they can let the white males, educated in many cases, rich, promulgate a system. Any lawmaker who is part of promulgating this system is not dumb. Somewhere there are benefits that his constituents are getting in larger amounts if you want to keep selling the land of the people of the United States for \$2.50 an acre, and you know billions of dollars are going to be made.

The 110 acres in Clark County, ID, are believed to contained an estimated 14 million tons of high-quality travertine, a mineral used to whiten paper. I am quoting from the New York Times article again. Last year, quote, "when American Barrick Resources, a Canadian mining company, used the law to buy a mine with \$10 billion in gold deposits for about \$10,000, Mr. Babbitt called it the biggest gold heist since the days of Butch Cassidy."

Let me read that again. Last year, when American Barrick Resources, a Canadian mining company, used the same law to buy a mine with \$10 billion in gold deposits for about \$10,000, Mr. Babbitt called it the biggest gold heist since the days of Butch Cassidy.

Mr. Babbitt, I am glad you have such strong language for it, you know. If you get \$10 billion from the people of the United States for \$10,000, you think somebody would be on television screaming about it. They could do nothing else except tell the American people about it.

The President and his campaign said we want to end welfare as we know it. Why does somebody not say we want to end the giveaway of billions of dollars mostly to foreign companies, but they have American backers? We want to stop American lawmakers from perpetuating this thievery. Why does somebody not have the guts to stand up and be outraged about stealing money which could provide coverage for thousands of people on Medicaid? For hundreds of nursing home people?

I continue to quote from Babbitt. I find this process where my hands are tied by a law signed by Ulysses S. Grant increasingly distasteful. Mr. Babbitt likes the word "distasteful." Again I am not criticizing Mr. Babbitt. At least he is talking about it. Where have the other Secretaries of Interior been? Where have the lawmakers in this House been? Why does not anybody talk about this? Why does anybody not expose it? Why is it the American people do not know that they are walking away with billions of dollars in minerals that belong to you?

□ 2000

He said that, "While Congress is cutting programs across his department," Mr. Babbitt is upset about his department being cut, as he should be, the Interior Department, he said, "While Congress is cutting programs across my department, the government is losing \$100 million a year from royalties from hardrock mining." One hundred million a year in royalties for hardrock mining. How many school lunches could you buy with \$100 million a year? How many prescriptions for Medicaid recipients can you fill for \$100 million a year?

I quote again from the article: "The bill to overhaul mining laws would require a 2 percent royalty on net profits on minerals taken under the 1872 law. Other proposals before the Congress would require companies to pay fair market value for the surface land, but nothing for the minerals." In other words, as we sit here today, as we talk today, there are Members of Congress in the Senate and in the House of Representatives who are protecting the thievery that is going on right before our very eyes. This is a Federal program that should have radical reform, radical change, but nobody is moving because white, rich, well-educated males benefit from it. They protect themselves.

I talked before about the end of entitlement for Medicaid. I said, "The end of entitlement for Medicaid is on the table." It is not here yet. Medicaid is a patient in the emergency room, on the operating table. Medicaid is about to be butchered. Aid to Families With Dependent Children is on its way to the morgue. They have cut the entitlements already. What would Franklin Roosevelt say? I am sure that the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt is quite angry and quite agitated tonight. Over the last few months, I am sure that spirit

has been quite angry and agitated at the wholesale destruction of the programs which he began to put in place.

Franklin Roosevelt was the architect of the Social Security Act, which created Social Security, and later Lyndon Johnson used Social Security to go on to create Medicare and Medicaid. They are all related. I am sure Franklin Roosevelt, having created entitlements for the poor, he also created farm subsidies for poor farmers. Farm subsidies for poor farmers now have become farm subsidies for rich farming businesses, agricultural businesses, so I am sure the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt is a little upset about that.

As he looks at the end of entitlements for people who are poor and need public assistance, for children, mostly, Aid to Families With Dependent Children is just that. If you do not have poor children, you do not qualify. We are ending Aid to Families With Dependent Children, the entitlement.

On the other hand, Franklin Roosevelt and the New Deal, the Congresses that surrounded him, were also the architects of the savings and loans program. They were the architects of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for banks and for savings and loan agencies. I wonder what the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt is doing as it beholds the kind of abuse that took place in the savings and loan program, the kinds of abuses that have taken place in big banks of the program that he started; because when Franklin Roosevelt stabilized the economy and the banking industry by creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, he brought into the equation every American taxpayer. The taxpayers stand behind the banks. Every American can put their money in the bank, knowing that up to a certain amount of money, it is insured, backed up by our great Federal Government.

Franklin Roosevelt started out with I think it was \$10,000, which was a lot of money at that time, and he probably never dreamed that the abuse, both official abuse and unofficial abuse, would lead to a situation where we would raise the amount from \$10,000 per person per bank to \$100,000 per person per bank. So you can abuse it by going to a lot of different banks and getting insurance.

It was not ordinary Americans who abused it. People who put their deposits into savings and loan associations did not abuse the loan. People who put their deposits in the banks which later on failed, they failed and we covered up the failure. Several big banks have failed in this country and we have covered it up and bailed them out with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation funds. The savings and loan debacle, which is the greatest swindle in the history of mankind, there are no other swindles as great as the savings and loan swindle, that could not be covered up. It was a federally assisted program.

Did we get rid of savings and loan associations? Have we put them out of

business? Have we been as radical in dealing with the savings and loan situation as we were with the reform of welfare? No, we have not. How many people were put in jail for their abuse, often outright stealing of large sums of money that then had to be replaced by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation? How many people have been put in jail? Relatively few, because most of them are white, middle-class, well-educated, and sometimes very wealthy males. They are not treated the same way as poor people, many of whom are Latinos and blacks, and most of all, poor. They are not treated the same way. If they were, then the savings and loans, the whole program would have had radical changes. Large numbers of people would have been put in jail. Large numbers of people would have been taken out of the banking industry.

There was collusion all over the place among well-educated, wealthy people in high places, in many cases: accounting firms who turned their heads away while all kinds of tricks were played with the books; lawyers who found a way to make everything that was done, no matter how terrible it was, legal.

In the State of Texas they had a situation where it was not the Federal Government regulating the savings and loan association, but the State of Texas. The State of Texas has the power to regulate the savings and loan associations in Texas, but the Federal Government, all of the taxpayers of America, stood behind their savings and loan associations, just as they stood behind those in New York or any other part of the country. Why do I say that? Because in Texas you had the largest number of savings and loan associations failing, the largest amount of money was lost in Texas, where the State had the power to oversee the banks. But the Federal Government, the taxpayers, stood behind the banks with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation dollars, so they made a killing in Texas. Not only did they oversee the situation and let it get out of hand any way they wanted to, they made millionaires, they made billionaires, most of whom have never gone to jail.

Then when it all collapsed, we set up the Resolution Trust Corporation. That was the device we set up. We did not take away the entitlement, we did not wipe out the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. We did not do anything as radical as what we are doing to poor people on welfare. No, we set up a Resolution Trust Corporation, a very complicated animal, and most of the offices of the Resolution Trust Corporation, the greatest percentage of the offices of the Resolution Trust Corporation, had to be based in Texas. That is where the greatest problem was.

California was next, and they spread it around. Denver had its Silverado Bank, the famous bank. The son of the President of the United States sat on

the board of the Denver Silverado Bank. It was spread around, but Texas had the greatest concentration. After they had regulated their own banks to make rich those they wanted to make rich, they they got the benefit of having a large Government agency locate there and spend money there and hire people there. Many people who were hired in the Resolution Trust Corporation had formerly worked in some of the banks that had gone, that failed, some of the savings and loan associations that had failed, so they got a jobs program as a result of swindling the American people out of a large part of that \$250 billion to \$300 billion.

This is happening in America. This happened recently in America, the largest swindle probably in the history of mankind, right before our eyes, and we reacted by coddling and taking care of those who were guilty.

Let me be more specific about guilt. You be the judge. The Silverado Bank in Colorado, in Denver, CO, the Silverado Bank made a deal with a person who came for a loan. One of the people who came for a loan wanted to buy a building. The building was assessed to be worth \$13 million, \$13 million. The bank said, "Look, we will accept an assessment of twice that much for the building, \$26 million, if you will deposit in our bank the extra \$13 million, so we will give you a loan of \$26 million for a building worth \$13 million on the condition you will deposit that \$13 million back in the bank, because we know the auditors are coming and we have problems."

If that is not a criminal action, I do not know what is a criminal action, but that was done by the Silverado Bank. That is just one of the things they did. They lost almost \$2 billion. They are not the largest offender. We all know Mr. Keating in California was the largest offender, but Silverado lost more than \$1 billion, and on the board of Silverado was the son of George Bush, Neal Bush. This kind of transaction took place, and later on as they sorted it out a recommendation was made that Neal Bush should be barred from sitting on any boards of any other banks. He protested vehemently.

Later on, I think secretly, out of the eye of the cameras, he even was made to pay some kind of fine, along with the other board members who had been a part of that situation. But nobody has said he should be put in jail or any other board members of Silverado should be put in jail. Two hundred fifty billion dollars, at least, and there are some estimates that it is twice that amount. You cannot get decent figures because the white males, the educated white males, the wealthy, educated white males who run the banking system and the accounting system and the lawyer system related to it, they make it so complicated you cannot get clear figures as of right now as to what the savings and loan swindle has cost the American people.

This is a Government program: wasteful, blundering, billions of dollars down the drain. Nobody has ever said, "Let us get rid of all savings and loans, let us get rid of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation." No, we have found a way to take care of the needs of the white middle-class wealthy who are involved in the abuse that have wrecked the savings and loan associations.

This is strong language, I know, but the barbarians do not hesitate to drive their spears through the bellies of babies. The barbarians have no shame. The barbarians come to the floor of the House and they talk about the need to streamline Government and the need to have a balanced budget by the year 2002. But the barbarians come to the floor of the House and they will not cut the B-2 bomber, which might cost us \$33 billion over the lifetime of the program. The barbarians with a straight face said, "We must continue the B-2 bomber." They fight hard on the floor and they win the votes to keep the B-2 bombers. The barbarians want to increase the funding for star wars, a system that has always been questioned by scientists.

The barbarians come to us and say that they want to give a tax cut, and I am all in favor of a tax cut, but if the tax cut is close to the same amount as the Medicare cut, the tax cut is, I think, \$240 billion over a 7-year period, and the Medicare cut is \$270 billion over a 7-year period; \$240 billion for the tax cut, \$270 billion for the Medicare cut. The barbarians look at us with straight faces and say, "We must have a tax cut. If that means that the elderly cannot have nursing homes, then so be it. If that means that prescriptions are going to be limited because people cannot afford to pay for their prescriptions, and of course when they cannot get their medication many will die, so be it."

The barbarians are not afraid to make their case forcefully. The barbarians want to end Davis-Bacon, which was created to stop bringing in slave labor. It was created by two Republicans to stop people from bringing in slave labor and undercutting the wages of working people. We are going to have to have some other kind of Davis-Bacon to stop the nations like India from bringing in computer programmers who work for one-twelfth the amount of money computer programmers who are Americans work for. We are going to have to have some kind of Davis-Bacon to stop the Russian physicians and technicians who are working here for the minimum wage. They can come here and undercut American physicians.

We are in a situation where the civilization, the society, must take some steps to do what is rational to make for an orderly transition, where people are able to earn a living and not disrupt things by allowing hustlers to take advantage of the situation by bringing in outsiders who can undercut

the labor market. The labor market that we may be protecting tomorrow may be our physicists and our chemists and our college professors. We had better take a look at the logic of Davis-Bacon, the invention of two Republican Members of Congress.

The barbarians refuse to look at this chart, which I will have in the future when I speak, I will have a larger version of it. This is the chart I have been talking about on several occasions.

□ 2015

This shows corporate versus family and individual share of Federal revenues. The share of the revenue burden that is born by corporations went down from 39.8 percent in 1943 to 11.2 percent today, while the share of the individual and family tax burden went up from 27.1 percent to 48.1 percent, and now it is at 42.7 percent.

This chart is one I bring to every session to let my colleagues see the remedy. If my colleagues want to balance the budget, here is the remedy. Balance the tax burden, raise the tax burden, the percentage of the tax burden borne by corporations. We can lower the percentage of the tax burden borne by individuals at the same time. We can do justice to the American people and American families who have paid enough high taxes. At the same time, we can balance the budget by having the corporations, which are making profits now at a higher level than ever before, having them pay a greater share of the burden.

It is a simple solution. We do not have to cut Medicare, we do not have to cut Medicaid, we do not have to act barbaric, in a barbaric way toward children and the elderly. We should on a rational basis sit down and take a look at the next 7 years, or as the President has projected, the next 10 years; whatever my colleagues want to do to balance the budget, it is possible to do it in a rational way.

On the one hand we have to save money by dealing with all of these abuses that we allow to go on if white, rich, educated males are involved, get rid of those abuses and at the same time look at the revenue question, the revenue side and produce the revenue in a rational way and a less painful way.

This is income taxes. We can take a look at the mining, how much more we may realize by taking a hard look at the mining situation or other resources that are presently owned by the American people that are being squandered. I have talked about the frequencies, the fact that we have auctioned off certain frequencies and earned \$9 billion already. We can take a hard look at that. There may be more.

There are solutions that are not barbaric solutions, and I ask the American people to keep their eyes on activities in the Congress for the next few weeks. It is your money, it is your civilization. We do not want to be accomplices to barbaric acts. We want to promote

the general welfare. We want to take America forward, out of the spirit of Franklin Roosevelt and the spirit of Lyndon Johnson. We want to continue to have a great society. We want to take care of the majority of the people that need to be taken care of. We are Americans, we are not barbarians.

FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. BONN of Oregon). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, earlier last week I shared with my colleagues and the American people some observations on the crisis that has occurred on the island of Tahiti in French Polynesia, as a consequence of French President Jacques Chirac's recent decision for the Government of France to resume testing of nuclear bomb explosions on the Pacific island atolls of Moruroa and Faugataufa.

Mr. Speaker, despite thousands of petitions and the pleadings from leaders of countries from Europe, from South America, from Asia, and especially from the Pacific island nations, asking France to refrain from conducting nuclear bomb explosions under these Pacific atolls, President Chirac went ahead and pressed the nuclear button 3 weeks ago, exploding a nuclear bomb under Moruroa Atoll with a nuclear punch of 20 kilotons. The nuclear bomb detonated, Mr. Speaker, was more powerful than the atomic bomb dropped on the city of Hiroshima, Japan—which, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, killed some 200,000 men, women and children, from the direct explosion as well as the subsequent radioactive contamination of the residents of Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that whenever a person calls out the word or name, "Tahiti," immediately many of us think of paradise—the swaying palm trees, the lovely Polynesian maidens—a place where there is much dancing and singing in the air, amongst the festive Polynesian Tahitians.

Perhaps, even more vividly, when the American people think of Tahiti, they recall visions from the silver screen classic, "Mutiny on the Bounty," first with Clarke Gable and later starring Marlon Brando.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is that the Pacific islands of Tahiti, Moorea, Huahine, Raiatea, and Bora Bora, truly are among the most beautiful volcanic islands in the world. The world famous writer and author, James Michener, has described the island of Bora Bora as the most beautiful in the world, and I agree with Mr. Michener.

Well, Mr. Speaker, as I stand here in the well describing the magnificent beauty of these islands, something very serious has happened since these islands became a colony of France some 150 years ago. The islands of French

Polynesia were what westerners would call colonized by France, after some 500 French soldiers with guns and cannons subdued the Tahitian chiefs and their warriors in the 1840's.

Mr. Speaker, after the French were kicked out of their former colony, Algeria, in the early 1960's the late Charles de Gaulle immediately ordered his subordinates to find a new place where the French Government could continue its nuclear testing program. The French Government decided that the two Pacific atolls of Moruroa and Faugataufa in French Polynesia would be the sites for the French nuclear testing program. The Government of France has now exploded well over 180 nuclear bombs on the under these two atolls in the Pacific. The French have been exploding their nuclear bombs in the Pacific for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, with the cold war at an end and the Berlin Wall down, there has been a tremendous sense of relief among the leading countries of the world. As a result, a moratorium was called by the leading nuclear powers, including France, 3 years ago to suspend nuclear testing altogether.

Mr. Speaker, in June of this year, the newly elected President of France Jacques Chirac, announced that France would explode eight more nuclear bombs—one a month, beginning this month of September until May of next year. And each nuclear bomb explosion, Mr. Speaker, shall be up to 10 times more powerful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima, Japan.

Mr. Speaker, despite extensive efforts made by citizens's organizations and government leaders, involving petitions and pleadings from all over the world to persuade President Chirac not to push that nuclear button—the Chirac government still went ahead and detonated their nuclear bomb.

Mr. Speaker, President Chirac said recently through international wire services that the eight nuclear bomb explosions were absolutely necessary to improve France's nuclear weapons capabilities and that the matter was in the order of the highest national interest of the French Government. However, nuclear physicists contend that the safety and reliability of nuclear weapons could be ensured by non-nuclear tests and have suggested that what France is really pursuing with resumed testing is completion of a new warhead design. This new warhead is supposedly an advanced generation of neutron bombs designed to destroy life, while leaving property intact. Dr. Hutton, a Monash University physicist told the Weekend Australian that what France is not telling the public "is the kinds of new weapons they are planning to use those simulation techniques to build." Why do they want simulation programs? "So they can go beyond the thresholds which will be defined in the Comprehensive Text Ban Treaty," he states.

Mr. Speaker, there are some very serious and troubling issues that now

need our national attention, and the international attention of other countries, as well. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, France has now initiated the nuclear arms race again, and I would nominate Mr. Chirac as the world's leading nuclear arms proliferator. Additionally, Mr. Chirac's actions raise another serious problem—if I were Chancellor Kohl or any citizen of German, I would feel very uneasy and uncomfortable about the idea that President Chirac has his finger on a nuclear trigger that he is trying to make more lethal. I would also wonder as a German citizen or as citizens of other European countries what assurances there are that French nuclear-armed missiles shall never be pointed at Bonn, Munich or Berlin, or other cities in Europe?

If I were Chancellor Kohl or a German citizen, I would further wonder what absolutely ensures that Mr. Chirac's nuclear forces would be used to defend Germany against in enemy country that might be an ally or a friend of Chirac's government. I believe, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in an interesting dilemma, and I am reminded of a Middle Eastern proverb that states that sometimes the friend of my friend is also my enemy.

Mr. Speaker, every country in Europe should feel somewhat uneasy about the possibility that France is the only country among the continental European nations with a nuclear trigger that may be pointed against any one of them.

Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of tension and uncertainty that Mr. Chirac has raised since the re-opening of its nuclear testing program last week. The implications are obvious, Mr. Speaker, and if Mr. Chirac's motive is to raise fear and apprehension about France's nuclear capabilities among its European allies, I must say, President Chirac has succeeded in this endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, the irony of this is that while 62 percent of the people of France do not approve of nuclear testing in the Pacific, the same majority of the people of France also want France to be recognized as a world leader and as a member of the nuclear club like Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and the People's Republic of China.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is that absent among the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and the world's nuclear club are two nations that are considered as having the second and third most powerful economies in the world. Mr. Speaker, I am making reference to Japan and Germany, respectively.

Mr. Speaker, if there is ever a time to examine regional and international conflicts as we confront them today, there is no way that we can deny the presence and considerable influence of Japan in the Asia-Pacific region and Germany throughout Europe, and certainly both nations to be directly involved with the affairs of the entire world.