

a time into Mexico, which then return to Colombia with 20 to 30 million dollars of U.S. currency.

FEINSTEIN LEGISLATION ON MEXICAN TRUCKING COMPANIES AND NAFTA

On December 18, 1995, the Secretary of Transportation indefinitely postponed the approval of applications from Mexican trucking companies seeking cross-border access to points in Texas, New Mexico, Arizona and California.

The legislation I have introduced would require three things occur before pending applications can be approved:

- (1) The Secretary of Transportation must certify to Congress that Mexican carriers are in compliance with U.S. size, weight, insurance and hazardous materials requirements;
- (2) The President must certify to Congress that Mexico is taking sufficient steps to combat international narcotics trafficking pursuant to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291k(b)); and,
- (3) The Congress approves the application by passing a prescribed joint resolution.

SENATOR FEINSTEIN'S MEXICO LOAN GUARANTEE LEGISLATION

1. Unless the President of the U.S. certifies Mexico's progress on drug enforcement issues, Mexico should not receive the benefits of the loan guarantees. The certification addresses the following:

- (1) Complies with all outstanding requests for extradition by the United States.
 - (2) Enacts and implements effective "money laundering" laws.
 - (3) Takes action to prevent Mexico's drug profiteers from taking advantage of plans to "privatize" formerly public assets, such as banks.
 - (4) Enacts effective laws to inspect and license trucks, cars and aircraft, as well as their owners and operators to assist drug crime enforcement.
 - (5) Enacts effective laws to control the import of major pre-cursor chemicals for methamphetamines and other narcotics.
 - (6) Takes specific action to effect the arrests of Mexican drug cartel leaders or other individuals involved in organized crime.
 - (7) Adopts a comprehensive program for drug enforcement and assists U.S. law enforcement to take effective action.
 - (8) Implements a plan and takes specific action dedicated to detecting and halting the large scale air transportation of narcotics.
 - (9) Take specific action to prosecute graft and corruption among civilian government and military officials that assist drug production/smuggling.
 - (10) Allows for asset forfeiture of property derived through fraud in connection with the loans or any illegal activity, such as drug trafficking.
2. Legislation would prohibit further disbursements from the Treasury Department's Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF).
 3. Legislation would require repayment of any short-term swaps within 90 days and prohibit any new medium-term swaps entirely.
 4. Legislation would prohibit the exercise of the six month renewal option.

□ 2145

THE VALUE OF A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, clearly we are having a very difficult time achieving a balanced budget. After taking the brunt of opinion from the liberal media, this Congress has been wondering why the President has vetoed so many reforms.

As a freshman, I ran on the principle of sound fiscal policy and a balanced budget, and as a part-time college instructor at Kansas Newman College, I taught the value of a balanced budget in economics classes. It was confirmed by the chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan: A balanced budget means a stronger economy. It means more jobs. It means more money in the pockets of working people.

But the President is staunch in defending the status quo, in defending big government and preventing Congress from right-sizing the Federal Government, which must happen if we ever hope to balance the budget. Instead, he is protecting big government waste.

For example, there is Clinton's Secretary of Energy, who is a congenital flier. Secretary O'Leary traveled more than 100 trips, 16 overseas. She has leased Madonna's luxury jet, taking some of those trips. The Government Accounting Office audited two of the overseas trips. They cost \$1.7 million and there are \$255,000 of expenses that are unaccounted for.

When you consider Travelgate, where the White House fired Billy Dale and seven other employees and drag Mr. Dale through the court system for 2 years over \$18,000, it seems inconsistent that we would allow Secretary O'Leary to go without accounting for that quarter of a million dollars.

And then there is Clinton's Secretary of Commerce, out-of-town Brown. His travel budget is 150 percent of his predecessor's, Robert Mosbacher. As reported in the Washington Times, an audit by a Department inspector general said, and I quote:

In Mr. Brown's case, the auditors found the Secretary seems to have been habitually accompanied by a slew of private-sector deadbeats masquerading as consultants who collectively still owe the government, that is, the taxpayers, \$360,000 for unpaid advances.

Going on, it says,

One wonders whether any of them were the same Democratic Party fat cats who routinely accompanied Mr. Brown around the world, grabbing their slice of the pie to which they no doubt felt entitled by virtue of their huge donations to the Democratic National Committee before, during and after Mr. Brown's tenure as chairman of the Democratic Party.

That article goes on to talk about how the Inspector General uncovered unpaid charges on government credit cards. Three hundred Commerce Department employees were delinquent on their payments on government credit cards. Six hundred people, some of them not even government employees, who have government credit cards, were using the government credit cards at automatic teller machines, ATM's, to get cash.

Can you imagine what it is like for taxpayers like David Walker, who

works the second shift at the Boeing Company? How long does he have to stand at his machine to pay enough taxes to cover the cash that has been withdrawn at the Commerce Department?

Those dollars were very much wasted. How long are we going to put up with this? I think we have put up with it for too long. I hope that the President will stop defending this tremendous waste, stop condoning this tremendous waste, stop defending and condoning the status quo, balance the budget. Our families do not deserve this type of treatment.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO KWEISI MFUME

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening I heard it announced that our colleague, Representative KWEISI MFUME, was submitting his resignation to the Congress of the United States. Tonight he cast his last vote, a vote which followed hundreds of votes in support of people across this country. I was pleased to serve in the Congress with him but especially on the Banking Committee a number of years ago when we both came to the House of Representatives. On that committee Congressman MFUME was a champion for affordable housing, for low-income housing, for consumer credit for all Americans and for access to loans for people who wanted to gain equity in business but who had been banned from doing so, also for those who wanted to buy homes but who had been red-lined in the past.

Congressman MFUME served very well in the Chair that you occupy now, Mr. Speaker. He knew how to keep order in the House. He did so with great dignity. But he also knew how to raise a ruckus in the name of social justice. We will all miss him greatly here. I feel as a Californian, I rise to speak about Congressman MFUME, and he is a representative, as you know, from Baltimore, MD, because I, too, am a native of Baltimore. My father Thomas D'Alesandro served as a Member of Congress for parts of Mr. MFUME's district that he now represents. So I was sorry not to be part of the Maryland delegation's tribute yesterday to Congressman MFUME but my committee assignments prevented me from doing that. Nonetheless, I am proud to have been a colleague of Mr. MFUME's.

I wish him and the NAACP much success under this new, fresh leadership and know that every Member of this

Congress who has ever served with him will be proud to make that boast.

Mr. Speaker, I want to once again commend Mr. MFUME for his great service to this House of Representatives.

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

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

HOUSE FAILS TO PASS FARM BILL

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

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I would certainly commend the gentlewoman from California for her kind words about Congressman MFUME. Members on both sides of the aisle are going to miss him. He spoke with a lot of emotion and from his heart and spoke with a lot of reason in a House that does not always exercise reasonableness, and he will be missed.

I have with me tonight my colleague and agriculture friend from Iowa, TOM LATHAM. We come here tonight out of a sense of terrible frustration for what is going on in the agriculture business in this House.

We made an attempt today to bring the 1995, and here we are in 1996, farm bill to the floor for a vote. The Committee on Agriculture has worked very diligently and very hard over the last 13 months trying to formulate and change the agricultural policy in this country to ensure that we have strong and viable agricultural programs moving into the 21st century. We met all day on Tuesday to discuss what is now the new form of the farm bill that is the second bill that has been passed by that committee, the first one having been a part of the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that unfortunately was vetoed by President Clinton. Had that bill not been vetoed, our farmers would have had back in December the ability to plan and determine what they were going to be able to do with their farm operation for 1996. But that did not happen. So we came back to the table on Tuesday of this week. We again brought forth the bill that was contained in the Balanced Budget Act of 1995, debated it thoroughly in the Committee on Agriculture on Tuesday and were in great hopes that it would come to the floor today. But, unfortunately, our friends on the other side of the aisle would not agree with us to bring this bill up today.

TOM, I know you share that same frustration and I know your folks in Iowa are as upset as I am and you are and as my farmers in Georgia are.

Mr. LATHAM. You are exactly right. I appreciate the chance to visit with you about it.

I do not know how to explain to my farmers in Iowa who last year were devastated by floods in southern Iowa going down into northeast Missouri, what to tell those people, why a group of people, led by the leadership on the minority side, would stop a farm bill that would finally give them some hope, give them some income next year. Just continuing what we have now would give them no income next year. These people are going to be asked to pay back their deficiency payments.

If you will remember just last week, we tried to put the farm bill on the continuing resolution and once again, because of the leadership of the minority party, they threatened a filibuster on the continuing resolution and thereby stopped the farm bill at that time.

I am very discouraged at this point, because even though we were promised cooperation so that we could advance a farm bill, it was not brought forth from the minority.

We will continue to work very hard and during the next few weeks to make sure that we do get an agreement, that we get a farm bill. It is needed very much for people who are in desperate straits at this time.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. We are leaving here today. We voted on and passed a bill to adjourn this House until the 26th day of February. So we know it is going to be then. You are going to have the same problem in going home to your farmers and saying, "Folks, you know, we're not even going to be able to take this bill up until the 26th of February," and it really will not make any difference whether we took it up in advance of that or not because the Senate is out until the 26th of February, they have already said that, and we are sort of going to be in limbo until then.

I am very frustrated, I am very upset about this, and I certainly hope that during these next 3 weeks as we are out of this House, that all Members on both sides of the aisle are going to take the opportunity to sit back and reflect on the fact that 2 percent of the population of this country feed 100 percent of the population of this country, as well as many, many other hundreds of thousands and millions of folks all across this world, because we grow not only the finest quality and most abundant agricultural products in the world but the cheapest agricultural products in the world.

□ 2100

Our farmers need good, solid farm programs to ensure that they are able to get some sort of return on their investment to keep them going. That has been our goal in this farm bill from January 4, 1995, when we started last year. It is still our goal.

Mr. LATHAM. You are exactly right, and this farm bill is real reform, a way of getting our farmers to respond to the market rather than the government control, the centralized control that we have had in the past, and look-

ing at the floor here, I mean, there are three people on the floor here this evening. If it had not been for what happened this evening because of the minority's technical procedural glitch they put in, we could be having this farm bill debate right now and passing the farm bill for the people at home.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. I thank the gentleman for joining me tonight. I know you have the same deep regret that I do that we do not right now have a farm bill in place that we could have had tonight. We will continue to work over the next 3 weeks and hopefully on February 26 we will come back in the frame of mind to get it done and get it done soon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BEREUTER 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 gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON 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 gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. MALONEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HERE THE CONGRESS GOES AGAIN

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to follow up on the previous speakers a little bit.

Mr. Speaker, here the Congress goes again, quite literally goes right out that door, heads for the airport, heads for the trains, heads for the highway, heading home.

Of course, it has been a rough week that the Speaker's leadership has presented to the Congress. The Congress has been in session all of 2 days of which part of it was being here for a joint session to hear the President of France, Mr. Chirac. There was a well-known Republican Attorney General named John Mitchell who served under President Nixon who had a saying, I believe it was Attorney General Mitchell, that when the going gets tough, the tough get going. The Republican leadership had modified that a little bit to when the going gets tough, it is time to go, go home, go anywhere, get out of here, because the going is tough right now.