

until 5 p.m. tomorrow, Friday, March 1, 1996, to file the conference report accompanying H.R. 927, the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (Libertad) Act of 1995.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute requests.

DAIRY FARMERS FACING FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

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

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the family dairy farmers in Vermont and throughout this country are facing disastrous financial problems. While consumer milk prices have been going up, the price that the dairy farmer receives has been going down.

Adjusted for inflation, the price Vermont dairy farmers receive has dropped 50 percent over the last 15 years. No wonder that today there are fewer than 2,000 dairy farms left in Vermont, and more and more of them are going out of business.

Tragically, none of the proposals that we were permitted to vote on during the farm bill provided for a significant increase in dairy farm income. In fact, the proposal that was passed threatens to actually lower the price that farmers receive.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to save the family farm, the six New England States each have passed the Northeast dairy contract, which finally would provide dairy farmers a fair price for their product.

In the final Senate bill, if the final Senate bill contains the Northeast dairy compact, this House must support that provision in the conference report. To do less would be to allow New England dairy farmers to disappear.

PROMISES MADE, PROMISES BROKEN

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, promises made, promises broken, the true motto of this failed Republican Congress.

One would think that at least here on Leap Day once every 4 years, Speaker GINGRICH could keep his promises. But, no, indeed, when one turns to a letter written the first day of this month, Speaker GINGRICH, Mr. DOLE, and Mr. ARMEY all wrote President Clinton saying, "Your administration has communicated to us that action must be

taken by February 29 to ensure there is no default. Congressional Republicans are committed to act by this date in a manner that is acceptable to you and the Congress in order to guarantee the Government does not default on its obligations."

Where is their action? It is not here on Leap Day. Next week we are going to talk about most-favored-nation treatment for Bulgaria, and they have yet to resolve the question of whether we will protect the full faith and credit of this country.

Promises made, promises broken, and the American working people are the ones who are going to have to pay the price for this failure unless we can turn this country and this Congress around.

BRING UP A CLEAN DEBT CEILING BILL

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my colleague from Texas said.

It is, in fact, true that the commitment was made that as of today the debt ceiling would be extended so that this country would not go into default. And I know we have heard previously, well, that deadline can be extended a couple of weeks because of legislation that has passed this House.

But the bottom line is what we are seeing here again is the same thing we saw with the Government shutdown. The Republican leadership wants to hold this Congress hostage to their ideological agenda where they want to cut Medicare, Medicaid, cut environmental programs, cut education, and they are saying unless you do some of that or unless you provide tax cuts for wealthy Americans and corporations, we are not going to extend the debt ceiling and we are going to threaten the possibility of this country going into default, again, a commitment that was made and a commitment that was broken.

They should bring up a clean debt ceiling. They should not extend it for another week or another 2 weeks but continue it through the rest of the fiscal year so the possibility of default is not out there.

I do not need to say what could possibly happen if this country went into default. Even the threat of it is a problem.

WORKING FAMILIES NEED HELP

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, now that the Republican Party has discovered working America, NEWT GINGRICH and his team are frantically working their agenda. They are desperate. The Contract With America has failed. Voters in the Republican Presidential pri-

maries do not want the Gingrich agenda of the last 14 months. They demand that the concerns of working families be the priority in Washington.

But a tiger cannot change his stripes. The Republican leadership is having a hard time crafting an agenda that deals honestly with the concerns of working men and women.

Will the Newt Gingrich Republican agenda support education, protect pensions, raise the minimum wage? No. According to the majority leader, DICK ARMEY, who is taking over the day-to-day operations of the House from Speaker GINGRICH, once again the new Republican agenda will be topped by a tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is not what working families need. They need help to pay their bills, send their kids to college and save for retirement.

My Republican colleagues wanted to offer them the same old failed policies of the past in a brand-new package. The American people deserve better.

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 will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

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

LASER SIGHTS LEGISLATION INTRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to announce a new legislative initiative that I am introducing, the Laser Assisted Gun Crime Penalty Act. I have drafted this bill with the assistance of the greater New Haven area police departments to provide an effective response to a new threat to our law enforcement officers and the public in general.

There has emerged on the scene recently a deadly addition to the arsenal deployed by gangs and other violent criminals. That new threat is called a laser sight.

The enhanced accuracy these devices bring—in the hands of the violent criminal—create a "super-gun," aimed with lethal precision at our police officers as they patrol our neighborhoods to serve and protect the public.

The streets of the Third Congressional District of Connecticut are not immune to this new technology. On Christmas Day of last year and in the

first weeks of the new year, guns equipped with laser sights have taken lives and evoked fear amongst families in my district and my local police forces. That is why I am introducing this vital legislation.

Laser sights have become a new rage, the latest deadly fad. By dramatically improving the accuracy of deadly weapons, laser sights turn street thugs into sharpshooters.

The Laser Assisted Gun Crime Penalty Act directs the U.S. Sentencing Commission to increase penalties for individuals convicted of crimes involving laser sights. This bill does not ban laser sight technology or guns equipped with laser sights. This measure punishes the criminal, not sportsmen and sportswomen or law-abiding gun users. This approach to crime and guns can be supported by both pro and antigun control advocates.

My legislation will deter the use of laser sight technology in street crime and require the sentencing commission to collect data on the use and frequency of laser sighting devices in criminal activity throughout the Nation.

My legislation has received strong endorsements from leading police organizations like the National Fraternal Order of Police, the International Brotherhood of Police, the Center for Prevention of Violence and Handgun Control, and the Violence Policy Center. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my bill and make our streets safer by cracking down on criminals who target law abiding citizens with laser sighting devices. Not gun owners.

We must send a strong signal to the criminal element that we will not tolerate the proliferation of this new brand of high-tech violence. Enacting this legislation will send a clear signal to anyone who would use a laser sighted super-gun, "If you do that crime, you will do real time."

□ 1630

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 1834.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN 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 Texas [Mr. DOGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. DOGETT 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 Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

WE MUST NOT WASTE MONEY ON WHITEWATER

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 of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the first thing that I would like to acknowledge is my full and complete appreciation for the oversight responsibilities of this body. Likewise, I think those of us in public life, those who have offered themselves for elected office and for appointed office, do owe a special obligation of responsibility to the American public, to this Nation.

Might I also add, however, that those who offer themselves, particularly Presidential appointees and Governmental officials, have always exhibited to the best of their ability, I believe, the highest degree of integrity. We realize that there may be exceptions and that we should not falter from the responsibility to ensure that the American people have the truth. But might I just for a moment reflect upon the ongoing proceedings in the other body, the Whitewater hearings.

The hearings have to date in the Congress cost \$900,000. This is separate and apart from the moneys being spent by the Independent Counsel. I might ask the American people this question: Oversight is one thing; but abuse is something else. We have determined today that the FDIC has decided not to sue the Rose law firm on issues dealing with Whitewater. We have already had previous reports by law firms that have not been dominated by any particular politics that have found no fault on behalf of the Clintons. Yet we now know there is an ongoing discussion about extending the debate and the proceedings of Whitewater, extending it and spending more money.

What the American people should be asking is what are the ultimate results? Will there be a criminal indictment? Is there a need to get more facts, or have we totally exhausted all facts that we could possibly find?

What we now see is a sense of redundancy, calling the same witnesses over again and, in actuality, trying to create perjury where none exists.

The reason why I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that we have some troubling times. First of all, we have no budget. We are funding education for our children at 75 percent of the need. In my State in Texas, Harris county,

the area that I represent, stands to lose some \$13.8 million in education funds because this body, this entire Congress, has no budget.

We are losing on Goals 2000 moneys. We are losing on title I moneys for disadvantaged children. We have already determined that public education does work. It has educated many in this body. I have had the privilege of being educated by the public schools, and I would say there are many teachers whose shoulders I stand upon that have allowed me to enter into the door of opportunity.

Yet we spend \$900,000 on Whitewater, and they are asking that we spend some more, with no resolution, with no conclusion, and no solutions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say it is time for this body to get down to business. We must deal with education. We must deal with the Justice Department funding that has the Cops on the Beat Program, another program that has helped citizens in Harris County, the sheriff's department, the police department, cops on the beat. That program is not funded and is threatened. The DARE Program, the Drug and School Safety Program, all of these are trying to meet the test of legitimacy in serving the American public. Yet, may I say it again, we want to spend another \$900,000 on Whitewater.

We now face, I think, a very interesting question; many of us have been discussing it for a long time. That is the issue of job creation in this Nation. We hear it in the very disjunctured chords of the political process. In fact, many have said to me we are frustrated by this ongoing debate that we see in the Republican primary.

I think it is good that these issues are on the table. But let me say to the American public, we have been discussing, those of us who have been concerned about job development, for a long time, the issue of raising the standard of living for citizens in America. I do not think we can do that without raising the minimum wage. I know that is a difficult question for small- and medium-sized companies. But I do believe if we look at the small fraction of the amount of raising the minimum wage and the number of years where we have not raised it, we will find that Americans will be fair and will realize that giving Americans a fair standard of living is in reality helping America move forward.

Then the job creation, does it come from total protectionist policies? No, it does not. Does it come from a fair assessment of the fair trade? Yes, it does. Does it come from an internal analysis of corporate America in dealing with the investment process, that it is not just the dividend, but it is in fact job creation. We must work with corporate America to develop jobs with America, we must not waste money on Whitewater.