

stopping illiteracy. He is the national spokesperson for the Foundation for Exceptional Children's "Yes I Can" program which encourages disabled children to reach their goals.

But while Neil is working to improve education, the House leadership is making drastic cuts in education programs. In Missouri, title I programs, which help children with learning disabilities, will lose over \$19 million—critical funds for students who need extra help in reading, writing and math.

I want to say to the House leadership—it's fourth down, 1 yard to go, and there are 30 seconds on the clock—let's go for it and reinstate the much needed funds for our children.

Thank you, Neil Smith, for sharing your talents and success to help all children achieve their dreams as you have.

#### PAYING MORE AND GETTING LESS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, let me tell Members what this debate is all about and what the administration and the liberals are talking about in education cuts. They are talking about paying more and getting less.

Let me read, if I may, about the great success of the programs they are talking about and what Republicans are talking about. This just appeared in the newspaper in Florida. Many of Florida's training and vocational education programs that are supposed to give Floridians the skills to find good-paying jobs are not working, according to the report.

State and Federal Governments spend about \$1 billion a year on vocational education programs in Florida, more than 1.2 million residents use the programs, but many of the State's programs fail to produce graduates or workers who can earn a decent salary. Most students who enter the programs never graduate.

In all, 37 percent of 347 job training and vocational programs perform poorly, according to the report. Only 20 percent of those who enrolled in high school vocational programs completed them. They want you to pay more and get less, and that is what this argument is about.

#### NO WAY TO RUN A CONGRESS

(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, when my Republican colleagues took over this institution 15 months ago, they promised to run the House like a business with the best management practices. However, their stewardship looks more like a Arnold Schwarzenegger screenplay.

The victims are everywhere. Because of the incompetence of this House majority, we are operating under a temporary spending plan, and today they want us to vote again on a 1-week extension of this spending plan. It will be the 10th temporary funding bill this year, no way to run a business or the House of Representatives.

Who suffers from this stop-and-go budgeting? Our kids, our children. Local school districts need to start planning now for the new school year, and they do not know what to expect from Washington. They do know that Republicans are slashing over \$3 billion from education. My Republican colleagues are leaving children and parents in the dark, and that is wrong.

Let us honor our commitment to education and our kids, and give them the tools that they need to succeed in the 21st century.

#### TAX AND SPEND IS BACK AGAIN

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, \$8 billion, that sure is a lot of money, and it just happens to be the amount of extra Washington big government spending that President Clinton wants.

Where will this \$8 billion come from? If the President has his way, it is going to come right from the pockets of the American taxpayer.

□ 1030

That is right, tax and spend is back again, but do not worry, America, because if you recall, the President said he feels your pain.

You know, I go home every weekend to the central coast of California, and do you realize how many people come to me and say, take more money, take more of my tax dollars and spend it on ineffective Washington programs? Well, you can understand no one does say that to me.

The message from the folks at home is very simple: They are tired of their tax dollars being spent on wasteful spending here in Washington, DC, and they are tired of spending for big government.

It is time for this Congress to say no to higher taxes, and it is time to say no to more government Washington spending.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TODAY DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit today while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee on Government Re-

form and Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on National Security, Committee on Resources, Committee on Science, Committee on Small Business, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1996

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 13, 1996, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 163) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of the joint resolution is as follows:

H.J. RES. 163

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That Public Law 104-99 is amended by striking out "March 15, 1996" in sections 106(c), 112, 126(c), 202(c) and 214 and inserting in lieu thereof "March 22, 1996", and by inserting in section 101(a) after "The Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996" the following " , H.R. 1977", and by inserting in section 101(a) after "The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996" the following " , H.R. 2127", and that Public Law 104-92 is amended by striking out "March 15, 1996" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "March 22, 1996".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 13, 1996, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will each be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Joint Resolution 163 and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the joint resolution before the House would

extend for 1 week the provisions of Public Law 104-99 and Public Law 104-92, the current temporary funding authorities for a portion of the Government that expire tomorrow night.

The Senate has not yet passed H.R. 3019, the fiscal year 1996 wrapup appropriations bill that we passed a week ago in the House. I understand that the other body will probably conclude their action on this bill today.

Mr. Speaker, I expect that there will be significant differences in the Senate amendments to the House version that will need to be worked out in conference next week. Last week, when we had H.R. 3019 on the floor, I said I expected the White House views to be represented in the conference, and I hope that that will still be the case.

But that will take some time. It cannot be done before tomorrow night, and that is why we are bringing this 1 week extension to the floor.

I understand the Senate will agree with this joint resolution and that the President will sign it. I urge all Members to support this joint resolution. We need to pass this quickly so that we can work on reaching agreement on our fiscal year 1996 appropriations wrapup bill with the Senate and the White House, and we hope to do that as expeditiously as possible so we can move on to the fiscal year 1997 appropriations cycle.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I honestly do not know quite what to say about this proposition before us. This is both a remarkable and a very frustrating day in the history of this institution as far as I am concerned. It is frustrating to me personally because regardless of the partisan differences which we have had in this House through the years, the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations process has been a bipartisan exception on most occasions to the partisanship which has sometimes plagued this House. This year it is amazingly different, and it has nothing whatsoever to do with any shortcomings of the chairman of the committee. He has tried his level best to see to it that the committee functions and he has tried his level best to see to it that bipartisanship remains, because this committee, when all of the shouting is over, has the job, the way this House works and the way the Congress works, this committee has the job to try to make things work after all the shouting is over. Yet, for a variety of reasons, we are not going to be allowed to perform that function.

We are now 166 days into the new fiscal year. We are debating, I believe, the 11th continuing resolution. We were supposed to have all of our work done by the 1st of October. But 80 percent of the domestic appropriations of the U.S. Government is still not in law, and we are now considering a 7-day continuation of funding in order to keep the

Government open, and probably next week we will have to consider another 7-day continuing resolution.

Stop and go, stop and go, and I think in the process, this House is going to look sillier and sillier and sillier. The main job assigned to the Congress of the United States by the Constitution is to serve as the chief stewards for the public purse and to allocate funding of taxpayers' money. And I am sad to say that on that score this year this body has become virtually dysfunctional. The machinery has stopped. Congress is stuck.

This House has taken a position, at least the majority within this House, has taken a position on insisting on very severe cutbacks in education funding, very severe cutbacks in environmental cleanup funding. That is a position which has not been taken by Republicans in the Senate. It has not been taken by Democrats in the Senate. It has not been taken by the White House. And it has not been taken by the American people. And yet we are stuck because the one caucus, the one group of folks who could change their position and help do something about this impasse will not do it.

Then we see in the Washington Post this morning a column by Robert Novak indicating that a number of freshman Republicans have gone to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the floor leader, asking him to stand pat against even the modest increases in education that were supported on a bipartisan basis, with only 14 dissenting votes in the Senate, just 2 days ago.

So I think that gives you some idea of what we are up against in trying to do the people's business.

Now the problem is not just that the Congress is looking sillier and sillier on this. The problem is also that that silliness and that obstreperousness is affecting the day-to-day ability of local school districts to function in an orderly way.

I visited a wide variety of schools in my district during the recess, looked at a lot of Federal programs in those school districts. The problem is that those local school districts are being left hung out to dry by this ying-yanging here in the congressional appropriations process.

April is the month that schools are supposed to sign contracts with the people who will be teaching our kids in September. Lots of those school districts do not know who is going to be in the front of the classroom in many of those classrooms. They do not know how they are going to be able to absorb the \$3.3 billion reduction in education, the largest education cut in the history of the country.

The Senate is moving somewhat in the President's direction. But this House is still stuck, and I would predict right now flatly that next week we are going to have to go through this entire process again. I think that is a shame. I think it is a shame for your

local school districts. I think it is a shame for people who think that at least once in a while Government ought to look like it knows what it is doing.

I certainly think it is a shame for the local school districts in my district who are going to experience continued turmoil and continued unanswered questions. And, frankly, I have had enough of it. I just do not think this ought to continue.

I would call to the leadership of this House to do what everybody knows is going to have to be done if this is going to be resolved. It is not going to do us any good to sit in a conference between the Senate appropriators and the House appropriators next week when we do not know what the House leadership will accept by way of restorations or by way of offsets for education and for environmental funding that is essential to the well-being of this country and the citizens we represent.

Until this House leadership focuses on that question, we are facing the prospect of another Government shutdown. There is no mistake about it. There is absolutely no reason that should happen. But people are going to have to give up their ideological Jihad on this issue if we are to break through this impasse. And so I call upon the House leadership, rather than going to war again, as some of our majority Members of this House appear to want the majority leader to do, I think this is the time to work things out.

So I would urge that proper attention be paid by the leadership of this House before this country stumbles into another shutdown which will further discredit this institution, which all of us are supposed to respect and love.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it was my hope that we could dispose of this resolution rather quickly, but it appears it is going to be somewhat prolonged. So let me just make the point that the wrapup continuing appropriations bill that we await action upon in the Senate governs four bills with the possibility that they may inject a fifth, the District of Columbia bill, even though it is working its way separately through the entire process. It has likewise been hung up in the Senate. If, in fact, the Senate puts the District of Columbia bill on this final wrapup omnibus bill, that is their right to do so, and we will have to deal with it.

The other four bills are hung up at this late date, and I agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin, that is indeed late, but they have been hung up not because of any inaction of the House of Representatives. In fact, three of those bills worked their way all the way through the entire congressional legislative process, went to the President of the United States before Christmas, and he vetoed them.

Last week we put them in one wrap up bill to work their way through subsequently, with the good hope that the President might work with the Congress and reach some agreement on them. Frankly, no agreement has been reached to date, and the process drags on for those three bills. Those were the Commerce, Justice, State, judiciary bill, the Interior bill, and the VA-HUD bill.

The fourth bill that provides education funding, which, I suspect, is going to be the topic of the next few speakers, is the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education bill that passed this House August 4 of last year. That is the last time we saw it, because it was filibustered by presumably the minority party in the Senate, and that is where it remains today. It never got out of the Senate. Every time somebody tried to bring it up, someone from the minority party would jump up and object to its consideration.

Now, I appreciate the tenor of the comments from my friend from Wisconsin. And, frankly, I am concerned that we are dragging out this process for fiscal year 1996. It detracts from the ability of the House to discuss the problems affecting the fiscal year 1997 appropriations cycle and the future bills inherent in that process become all the more difficult, because we have got to complete them by the end of the summer before the election season kicks in.

□ 1045

So every day, every week that goes by without completing the 1996 cycle, it is just a little less time that we have to devote to 1997. It concerns me greatly.

Mr. Speaker, but, putting the cards on the table, the fault does not lie with the House of Representatives, with either party. The fault lies jointly in the system. Three bills were vetoed by the President, one was filibustered in the Senate, and I am not going to take the blame for that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think the chairman of this committee ought to take the blame for it. It is not the gentleman's fault and I recognize that. But I do think that it is necessary to understand that the President was representing the overwhelming number of Americans when he decided that it was not correct to cut education funding by over \$3 billion; when he decided it was not correct to cut environmental enforcement by 22 percent; when he decided it was not correct to allow massive new timber cutting in the Tongass rain forest; when he decided it was not correct to allow a whole laundry list of environmental and other legislative riders to be added to these bills which have nothing whatsoever to do with budgeting.

So it seems to me that the record is clear that it is this House which is out

of step with public opinion and with the needs of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, every time I go out, people say, why can this body not be more bipartisan?

I honestly do not think the problem is with this committee. We have just heard from the chairman and ranking member. They are not at each other's neck. Yet for people that watch C-SPAN, this is getting to be like "Groundhog Day," the movie, where every day you get up and go through the whole same Groundhog Day again.

Mr. Speaker, here we are, 6 months into this fiscal year, and this is the 11th continuing resolution. Kind of jump-starting it, week by week, as we sputter along. This one is only going to be for a week. At the rate we are going, we may be down to hours. Who knows, Mr. Chairman? You have the patience of a saint. I do not think these gentlemen are doing this to get time on C-Span either. I think they would just as soon have had this thing done and wrapped up and put away.

What we are really talking about is we have had many times before where the Congress and the President disagreed and there were vetoes, but, you know what? We got together and worked it out. We have got a small minority within a majority refusing to let them get together and work it out, because they say that is capitulation.

So when they say the President will not work with us, what they mean is the President will not capitulate to us. And how can the President? He is the President of all the people. The people are saying we do not want these environmental programs cut, we do not want education cut.

Mr. Speaker, we just saw the leader in the other body come back, who is probably the freshest of all of us. He has been out campaigning. It now appears he has the mantle to carry his party into the presidency. He votes with the 84 people in the Senate who say, "We ought not to cut education that deeply and we ought not to do that."

So what we have is a large consensus in the other body, the President, a strong consensus here. But we have a minority holding it back so we cannot do anything but come out week by week with another one of these patch and plaster up over the holes and go on.

We are going to be committed to Groundhog Day forever unless we stand up. I think it is terribly important we realize this is the worst way to run a government, the least efficient, and get on with it.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, actually, I agree. It is not a great process. I would have loved to have expedited it and been done with it. In fact, I think, had we been able to

reach an agreement with the President on the remaining bills not enacted since Christmas, we would have been done with this process.

But back then the President closed the door, he vetoed the bills and then blamed the Congress for turning the Federal employees out on the street, when in fact it was his vetoes that did it. He won the PR wars during the Christmas holidays, no doubt about that. It was a public relations battle. I look back on what happened, and I think the President clearly won the PR wars.

But in negotiating with the administration since then, in trying to reach a resolution on these bills, we have found it singularly impossible to get them to seriously come to grips with the problems with which we are faced in these various bills. After all, in December the President said that he wanted to get the budget under control and that he was in favor of a balanced budget. In February he said that the era of big government is over. About that same time, he was telling us he wanted \$4 to \$6 billion in additional spending in those bills he had vetoed. Now we are getting the message that anywhere from \$8 to \$12 billion additional spending is necessary for the same bills.

The fact of the matter is that the signals coming from the White House have been extraordinarily mixed and conflicting, and they have not shown any inclination to come and meet us halfway and settle this problem so we can move on to fiscal year 1997.

Now, as we pointed out yesterday, the fact is that even if you use the President's \$8 billion figure that he wants in additional spending, notwithstanding his proclamation that the era of big government is now over, notwithstanding that the fact that the bills in question already appropriate some \$160 billion and he wants \$8 billion more, when you get into the details of what he is really asking for, you have to scratch your head and say, "Is this worth hanging up government over?" Is this worth saying to the Congress, "If you do not give me my \$8 billion, I am going to close down government?" Is this worth virtually hijacking the Congress and the processes available to us and threatening the closure of the operations if he does not get his way?

I would say no. The point is, when you look at some of the programs that he wants to spend money on, the GLOBE Program, for example, which I know is near and dear to the Vice President's heart, the Global Learning Observation to Benefit the Environment Program. Its goal is to teach youngsters in the United States and foreign countries how to do such things as collect environmental data such as rainfall. Now that is a real significant program.

Then there is the Ounce of Prevention Council. Last year they spent \$1.5 million on it, and this year they seek to spend \$2 million; and all they did

last year, they are supposed to let out a lot of grants but for some reason, perhaps the closure of Government, they said they were not able to do it. So they put out a nice glossy book, for \$1.5 million. Now they want to raise that now to \$2 million. Maybe it will be a thicker book.

Then there is the Safe and Drug-free Schools Program, which I think has a marvelous name. Really, who can argue with Safe and Drug-free Schools, unless you find out that, as reported in the Fairfax Journal in May 1995, that in Talbot County, MD, their schools spent grant money on a disk jockey and guitarists for a dance, lumber to build steps for aerobic classes, and school administrators spent more than \$175,000 for a retreat at a resort in Michaels, MD.

Additionally, another school district in Texas received a grant for \$13. How many bureaucrats had to get together and figure out that this was a really meaningful grant of \$13, and how much did that ultimately cost us? Congress would trim that program to \$200 million in fiscal year 1996. The President says that is not enough, \$200 million is not enough. Maybe we will have a lot more \$13 grants in the future if the President gets his way.

He would say that the \$8 billion is important because we have to spend more money on loan volume for direct student loan programs. The fact is, when you analyze what he wants to accomplish, you see that it would broaden the loan program for student loans for new institutions, some 481 new institutions, 138 of which are beauty, cosmetology, and barber schools. There is the Acme Beauty College, the California Medical School of Shiatsu, Naomi's Mile High Beauty College, the Ph.D. Hair Academy, and three schools of massage therapy. Now, that would be a real valuable use of taxpayer money.

Then there is the Advanced Technology Program we hear so much about, that the President wants \$300 million over the level in our bill. That is mostly corporate welfare. It is taxpayers' dollars going to big companies in order to fund new technologies.

Then there is the trusty old AmeriCorps Program. Get a volunteer and pay them. Of course, the average estimate of cost was some \$17,000 to \$18,000 per volunteer. That was one thing. Then we found out in Baltimore they paid them \$50,000. That is what the cost-per-participant was in Baltimore, \$50,000 a volunteer. I know a lot of American citizens who are paying taxes that would probably like to volunteer for that kind of a job at 50 grand apiece.

Well, on and on it goes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman made an interesting case. I would want

to say that my understanding is that some of the money the President has requested, he has also offered offsets. I think it is unfair to just say he asks for flatout money. He has offered offsets. I think we would want the record to be clear on that.

I think that many of these programs the gentleman is talking about are on the basis they have been block granted, for example the Drug-Free School Programs the gentleman is talking about. Those were block grants to the local communities for people to try and figure out how to spend the money in the best way to get the people's attention.

So I find it a little disconcerting that on the one hand you say we should trust the local officials, but then when we do and they do something and say this works in our neighborhood, then people say they did the wrong thing. So I do not know.

All I am saying is I do think it is very important to say there have been offsets, that I do not think this was just a PR war, and that this President has vetoed fewer bills than any President that has been here since I have been elected.

So I think the press looked at why he vetoed these bills, and I think that is why the people have been on his side.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct some of the statements made by the distinguished chairman of the committee. The President has not asked us to spend more money. What happened is very simple: The majority party in this House decided that they wanted to spend \$7 billion more on the Pentagon budget than the President wanted them to spend. The President decided, in the midst of the Bosnia crisis, that while he was opposed to that increase, he would accept the passage of that bill as a good will gesture during budgeted negotiations, as much as he did not want to spend that additional money. So that \$7 billion is moved over to the Pentagon.

Now the majority party is insisting that that \$7 billion come out of the hide of environmental cleanup enforcement, out of the hide of education, and out of the hide of the Interior appropriations bill. So they have made these cuts in education programs, in job training programs, in drug education programs and the like.

The President said, "I do not think that is a good idea, folks." So he came down here and suggested offsets. I have got a copy of them in my hand. He suggested spending offsets, areas of the budget that could be cut in order to finance the restorations he is looking for in education and training and in the environment.

So, No. 1, get off this idea that he is asking that more money be spent in the aggregate. He has suggested cuts to offset the money. If you do not like where he has taken the offsets, bring up your own list. But do not say the President has not offered ways to offset it.

Let me also point out that what you have got here in my view is a political rather than a substantive problem. Robert Novak's column this morning points out that the majority leader suggested that, and I am reading now, "There was no hope for the Republican Party if it succumbed to Clinton. Instead of cutting a deal with the President," he said, "Let's fund the government with a series of short-term extensions of spending authority."

□ 1100

Then he goes on to say it was asserted that there "would not be much chance for the Republican Party to win the allegiance of Pat Buchanan's followers if the party leadership showed the feather."

That is what is going on here; it is politics, and, because of that, we are being asked to take huge reductions in education funding.

Now my colleagues can laugh all they want about the GLOBE Program. I visited a GLOBE Program in Chipewewa County in my own district and watched those very young kids learn something about climate, learn something about the interconnection of various parts of the globe because of the environmental issue. I think the tiny amount of money spent on that program was well worth teaching those youngsters that we are all connected on this globe.

If we take a look at safe and drug-free schools, I will stipulate, if my colleagues do not like the way, and the gentleman just mentioned six items he did not like, spending for those items. I will happily accept cuts in all of these programs for the dollar amounts of the screw-ups that the gentleman has cited by the local school districts. But I do not grant that because some of the school district in Florida or some other State has screwed up the way they use safe and drug-free school money that my district should not get any, or that my district should not get summer youth because some other district may have screwed up the way they spent it. Fix it up in that locality, do not savage the program; that is the way to deal with it. My local police chief happens to think that safe and drug-free schools is an important program.

As far as student loans are concerned, there is absolutely no reason whatsoever why we ought to raise the cost of going to college for kids in this country by \$10 billion over the next 7 years. That is what our colleagues are asking us to do.

Title I; I do not know how many of my colleagues visited title I projects. I think they are crucial to an awful lot of families in my district.

AmeriCorps; my colleagues can laugh all they want about it, but those volunteers help coordinate other neighborhood volunteers to supervise kids who commit the majority of youth crime in this country, majority of violent crimes, between 3 o'clock and 6 o'clock in the afternoons because they are not

supervised. That is one of the things AmeriCorps is trying to correct.

So do not tell Chippewa Falls district, do not tell Wausau, do not tell Colby school districts, or all the other school districts in my district they have got to take a cut because of some political agenda of the majority party. I do not think the country is going to buy that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, and I would like to then yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

I just point out that, as my colleagues know, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, pointed out there are 760 education programs. Only 6 percent are actually dedicated to math, reading and science. Now this country spends \$26 billion on just the Education Department alone, and by some estimates when we include all the other departments in the Government, we may spend some \$200 billion on education, and yet the other side never wants to eliminate a program, they never want to close a program. Lord, do we need 760 education programs?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], is so enamored with his own opinion he states it as fact, and he is misinformed, first of all, that our schools, in almost every category we score last among the developed nations. Great Britain and Japan score far above us in every category, and in some categories Japan scores twice of our students in scores. We have less than 12 percent of our classrooms, and I laud the President for his ideas and working to get our classrooms upgraded. But we have such a proliferation of dollars with 760 programs spread over 39 programs.

The ranking minority member on the budget agrees that the title I program, the direct lending Government-run program, should not be. A billion dollars just in administration fee capped at 10 percent. GAO estimates a greater cost, of up to \$3 billion just to collect the dollars. We took those savings, we increased student loans, we increased Pell grants and so on.

Take a look at HHS, take a look at the Department of Education's recommendation, the Department of Education, not exactly a right wing group. Every study shows that title I and Head Start are not meeting their goals, that you take two students track them along the same lines, and there is no difference, and yet we are spending billions of dollars. Did we kill them? No, but we said it was wrong to ask for quality, is it wrong to ask for performance? And a program has been reduced by 500 percent and is serving less children. Is it wrong for us to manage a program? But if that works in our colleagues' State, just like drug-free schools, that block grant, the State can decide. If

Head Start works in our colleagues' State, do it, and fully fund it. If title I, fund it. I support their program. I think it is a great program, and I think it should be funded. But what we are reducing is not cutting. What we are reducing is the bureaucracy here in Washington.

In title I, in Head Start, and in the direct lending program we are reducing the bureaucracy here in Washington, DC, and focusing the dollars down to the local level. We are insisting on quality, we are insisting on parental control to get the dollars down so we can pay teachers more instead of the mess that we have right now where those dollars are being squandered here in Washington, DC. Now my colleagues may want to call that a cut, and I will say, "Yes, Mr. OBEY, it's a cut, it's a cut of your precious bureaucracy, and that's what you are having a problem with."

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority can find additional money if they were not so anxious to provide tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. \$17 billion in a windfall to the richest corporations in this country, and would have them pay no tax at all. Come on, that is the shame of this, these cuts to education.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the mind-boggling incompetence of the Republican majority in running this House. Six months into the fiscal year, twice shutting down the Government, threatening to do so for a third time, they have brought to the House floor the 10th stop-gap spending bill, this one for only 1 week. The failure of the Republican leadership to get their act together, to tend to the people's business, has a real impact on my district and virtually every community in America.

I met recently with parents, teachers, and school officials in my district who told me that the proposed \$8.6 billion in a cut to Connecticut's basic training skills, reading, writing, arithmetic, not bureaucracy, to reading and math skills. It is going to affect 9,200 kids in my State, the loss of the dollars for safe and drug-free schools, the DARE Program that works.

These are not the priorities of the State of Connecticut or America. These are not the values that we hold dear in this country. Public education has been the great equalizer in this Nation for all kids despite what their economic circumstances have been.

Republicans in the other body have got the message. They voted 86 to 14 to restore education funds. I hope the vote in this House will wake up the people here and say to the Republican revolutionaries, support education, pass long-term legislation that puts the education needs of America's kids first.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. I thank my distinguished chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no question but that the majority is just as committed to quality public education for the children of America as anyone in the minority. To suggest otherwise is nonsense. But let us face it, there are many, many Government programs that have not provided that kind of quality and that have wasted taxpayers' money. It is time to review them to see if we can do better, and I know that we can do better.

In higher education, it is suggested by the other side that there is going to be less money for student loans and grants. This is simply not true. There is no child in America that is going to have any less money this year than last year for their higher education. The cuts are in the administration of the programs. We can reduce overhead and do a much, much better job of educating children.

On primary and secondary education, all of the cuts in the House bill would amount to less than three-quarters of 1 percent of the money spend on primary and secondary education in the United States.

The sky is not falling. What we are attempting to do is to prioritize; to look where the money is wisely spent for good results, and to support those areas, and to cut those where the money is not wisely spent or is simply wasted.

With respect to title I and Safe and Drug Free Schools, we would like to have greater targeting so that the money goes where it is needed and does not go to almost every school district in America; many of which do not need it at all.

I would like to see targeting for title I done much more tightly. We do not need the money in New Trier High School in Winnetka IL. It is needed in the inner cities and rural areas where we need to get results.

We also need to look at the programs themselves. Do they work? Are children really able to achieve a place in the work force where they can be productive citizens, or are they unable to read and unable to compute? If the programs are not working, by God let us reform them so that they work.

What we see today is really an issue between the old politics, represented by the other side, of serving one special interest in America after another, and the new politics, which I believe we represent, of getting solid results and make Government work better for people in this country.

H.R. 3019, which passed this House last week, included additional funding for many high priority programs. We are willing to spend more money. Obviously we knew from the very beginning that we would have to move toward the President who has different priorities than the Congress. We are willing to sit down and negotiate these matters out, and if more money is desired in certain areas, fine, let us provide it. But let us not add more to the deficit, for if that is what the President wants to do, and it seems that that is exactly what he wants to do, the answer is no.

Let us not increase taxes. That is not the problem in this country. We are taxed enough. The problem is that we spend too much. We have to spend less and use the money we do spend better.

And finally, no funny money, no short-term fixes that do not work. If my colleagues want to provide some additional revenues that are real and long lasting, we will consider them. If they want to fund programs that they think are priorities and ought to have higher spending levels we are willing to do that right now; but no adding to the deficit, no tax increases, and no funny money.

We can work together to find common ground on this matter. Let us find that common ground, let us make government work better for people, let us get results and let us stop playing the old political games.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, yes, I support a special interest in the area of education. The special interest I support is kids. They are our Nation's future, and I make absolutely no apology for it. Let me simply say, the facts remain that if we follow you on the reconciliation bill, we will wind up requiring people to spend \$10 billion more on interest costs for student loans over the next 7 years because of what they put in the reconciliation bill.

And that is going to benefit the banks. That is not going to benefit students. I have talked to college after college in my district, desperate to see the direct loan program expanded so they can get rid of some of the paperwork under the indirect loans that favor the banks but not the kids.

I would also make the point that if my colleagues do not like the fact the proprietary schools are included in some of these programs, cut them out. I am for that. If my colleagues do not like the way some of the education programs work, cut them out. But then use that money in other education programs of a higher priority. Do not use education cuts to finance a tax cut for rich people. That is not what this country is looking for.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT].

□ 1115

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I agree with my colleague on the Republican side that there is certainly something

new about this Congress. Indeed, it has achieved new heights. It has scaled new mountains when it comes to mismanagement, near total and complete mismanagement.

When we look back over the course of the last 14 months of this great new revolutionary Congress, what is there to show for all the effort? Near nothing, somewhere between nothing and next to nothing; a lot of hot air, a lot of rhetoric. But in terms of doing anything that affects the lives of ordinary working people in this country, nothing has been accomplished by this Congress. This year it has been hurry up and stop.

Mr. Speaker, I am really pleased that my Republican colleagues have so much love in their hearts that they needed 3 weeks to celebrate Valentine's Day. I wish they would express a little of it on the floor of this Congress. I wish they would come here and get to work on the problems this country faces. Their great division is not with us, not with the President, it is with their Republican colleagues over in the Senate, who rejected in these past few days their radical cuts in Head Start. What they propose is not a continuing resolution but a continuing non-resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin knows very well that I have been in Congress for 16 years now. During all of that time, his party was in the majority. During all of that time, I have personally opposed a 100-percent guaranteed student loan program. Government should neither guarantee any industry their profit nor should government by left holding the bag for defaults at the 100 percent level.

But guess what; the minority party that was then the majority never changed that law. Today, they are promoting yet another plan that leaves the taxpayers holding 100 percent of the defaults, and it is called the direct lending program.

This program looks good at the beginning, because the defaults are not realized until later on, when they occur. Both programs, the 100-percent guaranteed student loan program and the direct lending program, have the same problem: They leave the taxpayer holding the bag on all defaults.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, and what we are going to get is an 85-percent loan program, where there is participation in the private sector, and where the banks are not guaranteed a profit and must make lending more wisely. If there are defaults, the banks participate in handling than on behalf of the taxpayers. That is the way we should have done it a long time ago. The gentleman's party failed to do it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, let me simply point out that one of the key leaders in proposing the changes which we now have in student loan programs, including the direct loan program, was that "well-known left-wing radical," the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI], who last time I looked was a Republican. He helped this House lead us into a better mix of student aid. You people are now trying to cap the programs that represented the reforms of just a year ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR], the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 10th or 11th, depending on how one is counting, continuing resolution that we have had before this House in the last 5 months. We are here halfway through the fiscal year. Five appropriations bills still have not been completed because the Republican leadership cannot get their act together. Every single day, millions of dollars in taxpayer funds are being waived through inefficiency and uncertainty. Now, once again, we are being asked to make the biggest cuts, biggest education cuts in the history of this country.

Mr. Speaker, the value of education has always been embedded in America's national soul. A long time ago mothers used to pour honey on the books of their children so when they went to school they would smell the sweetness of education. When kids were working out in the fields out west, mothers used to bring them in when they would see a teacher come by for the educational benefits that were there.

Mr. Speaker, we just had a little discussion here about student loans. What galls me is the fact that your leaders, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], got through school on student loans. In fact, if it was not for student loans they would not be where they are today, which is the only good reason, from my perspective, to be against student loans. Nonetheless, they want to pull the ladder up and deny students the opportunity that they had to be successful in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, education is our heritage. It is our heritage. We are living in a time when 70 percent of our kids will never finish college, a time when what one learns will make a big difference on what one is going to earn. Yet, this bill responds by making the biggest cuts in education history. It cuts safe and drug-free schools 25 percent, drastic cuts in the DARE program.

It cuts the school-to-work program, which is just getting off the ground, 18 percent. It cuts title I funding, if we take this out through the whole year, by \$1 billion, 40,000 teachers losing their jobs. It kicks millions of kids off of math and reading programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman, do not tell us we are making

these cuts to give kids a better life. This bill will deny millions of students the skills they need for a better life. Now is the time that teacher contracts are being signed. Now is the time that cities are submitting their school budgets. Now is the time that kids are making their important decisions about where they are going to go to college and if they are going to go to college, but they cannot do that if we keep messing around, week by week, month by month, with their funding, and messing around with their lives.

Mr. Speaker, we all know the President is not going to accept these extreme cuts. He understands that education needs to be a priority in this country. In order to force through an extreme agenda, my colleagues are willing to hang American schools and communities and families out to dry.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, let me just say this. America deserves a break. It deserves a government that is on their side. They do not need a Congress that is going to stand in their way, but that is exactly what this bill does.

I urge my colleagues, vote no on this bill, and let us give our kids the opportunity they deserve, the opportunity that the gentleman and his leaders have had on that side of the aisle. Let us give them the opportunity to be successful and to live the American dream. Vote "no" on this resolution.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I love the word of the month, "extremists." Republicans are extremists. I must hear it from 43 Democrats a day in one form or another, either on the floor or somewhere on the media.

Mr. Speaker, they are talking about how we are cutting education, knowing full well there are 760-some-odd education programs, only 6 percent of which go to math, reading, or science. But if we want to pare one down, we are extremists, and when we did send a perfectly good bill, trying to pare down some of the inefficiencies, to the Senate, it was the Democrats that filibustered that bill for 9 months. The reason we are here talking about education is because their party filibustered it over in the Senate, and would not let it move.

Mr. Speaker, for crying out loud, let us try to be a little credible. We are not extremists. We are trying to save the American taxpayer money, and make sure that the money is spent on the people who deserve the money, and that is the students.

Mr. Speaker, I heard concern for the kids. Where is the concern for the kids when we are spending billions of dollars, anywhere from \$26 billion to \$200 billion, on education programs in this country, and yet, since 1972, SAT scores have dropped from a total average of 937 to 902 in 1994; 17-year-olds scored 11 points worse in science than in 1970; in reading, 66 percent of 17-year-olds do not read at a proficient level, and reading scores have fallen

since 1992; United States students scored worse in math than all other large countries except Spain; and 30 percent of college freshmen must take remedial education classes.

Mr. Speaker, I hear the compassion, I hear the charges and the labels of extremists, but I do not hear any good that is coming from the billions of taxpayers funds that they have wasted on one redundant, inefficient, unnecessary program after another. If Members want 100 programs, fine, or if they want 200 programs, maybe that is a good idea. But 760 is absurd and obscene.

By the way, I heard earlier a little charge that we are beefing up, building up the military-industrial complex; that we are not cutting defense enough, or that we are building it up too much, spending more than the President wants.

Mr. Speaker, this is the President who stood in the Rose Garden on December 13, 1994—check it out. There was an article in the Washington Times and the Washington Post where he was surrounded by his generals and his admirals, wrapping himself in the flag—and said

I've got to spend \$25 billion more on defense, because the support and logistics and equipment of my troops is going down the tubes. We are putting people who are expected to maneuver tanks on the battlefield out on the training field, and they are working their courses rather than driving tanks because they cannot even afford the gasoline.

We were in a position where planes were crashing, and maintenance for tanks and boats and ships was not being adequately made. Even the President of the United States, this President, who says we are extremists has consistently said, or at least back then said, for all the TV cameras, he needed \$25 billion more than was previously appropriated for the Defense Department for concern for our troops.

Since then he has deployed troops to Haiti; he has deployed troops to Bosnia; he has people on alert near China, in the area between China and Taiwan, two carrier battle groups. He has troops going all over the world, and what did he do? Instead of pushing for that \$25 billion extra this year he recommends a \$12 billion cut on top of his low recommendation last year that we increased by \$7 billion. So in effect, there is almost \$50 billion difference between what the President said that he needed on defense and what he was willing to give the people in uniform, who are risking their lives every day on behalf of every freedom-loving American citizen.

Mr. Speaker, I say that defense is not an issue, because we did not give the President the cuts he asked for in the fiscal year 1996 bill, and we do not intend to give it to him in the fiscal 1997 bill. In fact, defense is expected to be level funded. Actually, it went down by \$400 million in fiscal year 1996 under fiscal year 1995, so defense is not an issue.

The President keeps sending troops all over the world, and yet he just does

not want to support them. That is his problem. He can take that to the American taxpayer and to the American voter in November. But the real issue is whether or not the Democrats have ever seen a program that they did not want to fund, or an American taxpayer dollar that they did not want to waste on an unnecessary program.

I have a list of some of the programs that money is in fact being spent on. We talked about the book. This \$1.5 million book of the Crime Prevention Council. We talked about the other programs that money was being spent on. The direct loan third-year schools program, that the President wants to expend. He says we are not spending enough money on it. If we do not spend money on these items, he says, we are extreme, we are extremists. We are radicals in Congress.

We are extremists because we do not want to spend money on another 138 hair, beauty, cosmetology, barber schools like Earl's Academy of Beauty. It might be a nice place, but how much taxpayer money should go to it? Or to the International School of Cosmetology; three Columbine Beauty Schools in Colorado; Naomi's Mile Hi Beauty College. I will bet that is a nice one. There is the Ph.D Hair Academy, Hair Arts Academy, BoJack Limited Academy of Beauty Culture, Patsy and Rob's Academy of Beauty, Acme Beauty College, Aladdin Beauty College Number 22. What happened to 1 through 21? I guess they are already getting funded, but now he wants to fund number 22, and we are extremists if we do not go along with it.

There is the Southern Nevada University of Cosmetology; 15 Empire Beauty Schools, beauty schools in Pennsylvania; the Avant Garde College of Cosmetology; the Circle J Beauty School.

These are nice places, but do they deserve so much taxpayer dollars that the President puts a gun to Congress' head and says "Give me my \$8 billion to spend on these foolish things, or else I am going to close the Government down?" That is essentially what he is saying.

He wants to spend money on the Desert Institute for Healing Arts, the California Medical School of Shiatsu, the Euro Skill Therapeutic Training Center, the Florida Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine, the Myotherapy Institute of Utah, and three schools of massage therapy. "If you do not fund these things," President Clinton said "We are going to close the Government down, and it will be the Republicans' fault and they are extremists." Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1130

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, the argument from the other side is we are not doing as well in international comparisons on education as we should, and so what we



ought to do is cut education support by \$3.3 billion. That may not be extremist. It is dumb.

The issue is not who did what in the Senate or in the House. The issue is simply whether or not it is smart to run the Government 1 week at a time so that nobody can plan what to do next in every local school district in the country. Again, that may not be extremist. It is dumb.

I would urge you to stop it and recognize we need to fund this Government for a full year at a reasonable level. If you do not like these other programs, reform them.

But I do not see any arguments that you made for cutting back on chapter 1. I do not see any arguments you made for cutting back on school-to-work. It would be kind of nice if we paid some attention to kids in this country who are not going to college. That is what the school-to-work program tries to do. Again, it may not be extremist, but it is dumb to cut those programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, what is extreme about today's action is that once again the House Republicans are turning their back on America's children. Today the House Republicans are taking a hike on America's education for its children, because today the House Republicans are confirming their position against that of the Senate, where a bipartisan coalition has determined that America's children deserve this support for education.

It is one thing to get up here and read off all these programs of cosmetology. There are no title I children enrolled in those schools. Why are you cutting the title I children? There are no high school children enrolled in those schools. Why are you cutting those children from this program?

That is what is extreme. You talk about one thing and you do another. You ought to go back to your schools, as I do every Monday, and visit with the title I children, visit with the school programs and talk to them.

Then you will understand how extreme your position is, how you are playing Russian roulette every 7 days with the education of our children, with our teachers, with our parents and with our communities. Every 7 days you threaten to shut down the Government. That is what is extreme.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, what this is all about is priorities. What the Democrats are saying is that if we look at this continuing resolution, education, the amount of money that goes to our schools is cut by 13 percent. If we look at the amount of money that goes to environmental protection, it is cut by 22 percent.

The gentleman from Illinois said that this is all about priorities and that is what this is about, priorities. The Democrats are saying that there is insufficient funding, there are too many cuts here in educational programs, back to our schools, environmental programs.

The President was in New Jersey last week. He talked about the Superfund program and how many sites will not be cleaned up, hazardous waste sites, because of these cuts constantly in these continuing resolutions, and it is irresponsible to act this way.

We are now talking about a 1-week CR. How can we continue to operate a government on a 1-week basis? What does that mean to the Federal Government? It means that a tremendous amount of time has to be wasted in just gearing up or gearing down because agencies do not know how much money is going to be available.

When the Republican majority was elected, they were elected to govern, and they have not been governing. They come here with these 1-week resolutions, and it is about time that we said enough is enough. Vote "no."

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, earlier it was said that there were cuts in higher education funding. Let me be clear about this. The loan programs are entitlements. They are not in this short-term spending bill at all. The money continues to flow exactly as before.

The work-study program, the TRIO program, the SEOC program, the Perkins loan program are all level funded. The Pell grant program was increased by the largest increase in 1 year in history, to the highest level in history, by this side. That is an increase, not a decrease. The only program that was eliminated is State student incentive grants, exactly as the President had suggested.

Let me say regarding title I, Mr. Speaker, that giving the money for a program that does not work is not good government. The program is not working. What we must do is devise a better use of the money and target it to where it is most needed and make a program that really does work.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, when we cut through all the shouting, I think it is easy to see by looking at the actions of other parties who is the odd man out today and who is not.

The Senate 2 days ago, with only 14 dissenting votes—and the last time I looked, the Senate was controlled by the Republican Party, the Majority Leader was a fellow who is going to be the Republican candidate for President. When the Senate acted on this bill, on the Labor-Health-Education-social services funding bill, with only 14

dissenting votes out of 100, they put back \$60 million in the Goals 2000 program. They put back \$917 million in the school-to-work program. They put back \$814 million in title I to teach the most disadvantaged kids in this country. They put back \$82 million in vocational education.

The gentleman from Florida says it does not work well in Florida. It works terrifically well in Wisconsin, and we do not want to cripple that program.

They put back \$58 million in Perkins loans. They put back \$32 million in SSIG. Summer youth, you are wiping out that program, an awful lot of jobs for kids who are going to be on the street instead of learning how to work. School-to-work programs in the Department of Labor \$91 million that they are trying to put back. Head Start, \$136 million.

We can talk all we want about how some local school district has applied for money and used it in a stupid way. I do not doubt that. It is the job of government to try to cull those out. You talk about the way some proprietary schools have abused these student aid programs. That is why I would like to see most of them largely declared ineligible, unless they can demonstrate they have a solid record of performance.

I pay taxes, just like you do. My constituents pay taxes, just like you do. I deeply resent it when a dime of it is wasted. But I also deeply regret it when Members of this House use some little screw-up somewhere to provide an excuse for obliterating support for chapter I for a million kids in this country who need some help to get ahead.

Now, I just released a report on Monday which showed that the wealthiest one-half of 1 percent of American families in this country saw their net worth grow from \$8.5 million in 1983 to \$12.5 million in 1989, just in the 1980's alone.

The net worth of 90 percent of American families did not grow by almost \$4 million, as it did for the high rollers in this society. The net worth for most families in this country, 90 percent of them, grew by \$2,000 in the 1980's. They had a grand total of \$29,000 in assets. The best way for most working families to get off the treadmill, to get ahead for their kids, to build a decent future for their kids, is to expand, not contract, educational opportunity.

Now, if you do not like what was done in the past, fix it. You are the majority party. If you want to consolidate those programs and clean them up, do it, and we will try to help you. But do not use some of these local screw-ups as an excuse to gut chapter I for a million kids or to say to hundreds of thousands of kids who are looking for summer jobs, "Sorry, it's more important go give the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country another tax cut. You guys worry about your kids some other day".

That is what you are saying when you are cutting education by over \$3



billion. When you come in here and say we ought to cut back on environmental enforcement by 22 percent, that is disgraceful. It destroys the future environment for every family that wants a decent environment. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Vote "no" on this proposition. It is a silly 1-week, childish game.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, here it is. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. We are extremist for trying to save the taxpayers money and to not spend money on silly, dumb programs that do not work.

Compassion is not just exclusively on that side. We have got a lot of compassion. We have got compassion for the kids. We have got compassion for the taxpaying citizen, the hard-working American people that want to make sure that if they are going to send their money here, that it is going to be spent wisely.

In reality, this should be debate simply about a continuing resolution for 1 week so that we can go try to wrap up this whole other exercise on all these bills, three of which were vetoed by the President and one which was filibustered by their guys in the other body. Now let us not make any more of this than that.

The summer youth jobs program we heard about, that is a total other bill. That is not even in this resolution before us. That issue should be resolved as it was signed by the President in another bill. It is over because it did not work. It was getting money to kids who just did not work, and it did not train them for anything.

The title I program that the gentleman talks about goes to rich school districts that do not need it. It needs to be revamped. When you want to get money to kids that need help, let us not spend it on kids that do not need help.

All we are saying is fix the programs first. You have had 760 programs to do all the wonderful education things you want. You have wasted it, and the SAT scores have plummeted. They have gone down. It is time to take a new look. It does not take a new program. It does not take more money. What it takes is some common sense, and that has been totally lacking over there for the last 40 to 60 years.

I urge the adoption of this poor, measly 1-week bill, and let us get the real bill up next week.

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this short-term funding bill, both in regards to the substance of the bill and the process under which we are dealing with these very serious issues.

The record on spending issues is clear—I've supported the balanced budget amendment, the line-item veto, and have voted often enough to control spending to make the Concord Coalition Honor Roll. I know we need to control spending.

But there are some serious mistakes being made in this bill and in the appropriations process overall for fiscal year 1996.

I respect my colleagues, Chairman LIVINGSTON and Chairman PORTER, and know that this has been a difficult year for the Education, Labor, HHS appropriations bill. But I have to object to the serious cuts being made in support of education in this country. When I'm home each weekend, I am constantly contacted by the school administrators, teachers, and parents who are concerned about the shrinking support they are receiving for very important education initiatives. And with Eastern Illinois University, Southern Illinois University, Millikin University all in my district and the University of Illinois close by, I am also concerned about our approach to supporting opportunity for our students and families to access the education they need to compete on the job market.

The title I program which helps our school districts serve families of modest incomes is important in my district. The title III program which serves our community colleges is important in my district. We are not doing as well for our communities in these areas as we should.

If we need educational reform, I stand ready to help my colleagues fashion a stronger approach than what may now be in place. If we need to control spending, my record is there in terms of sorting out our priorities and getting return for our investment.

But I oppose funding the Government on a weekly, monthly, or quarterly basis. And I oppose doing so on 75 percent of funding in the previous year. That obscures the very real policy issues we face in education, health care, the environment, and our economy as a whole. I oppose this bill and urge my colleagues to do better in future efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, March 13, 1996, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 179, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—238

Allard  
Archer  
Arney  
Bachus  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)

Bartlett  
Bass  
Bateman  
Bereuter  
Billbray  
Billrakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Blute

Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bono  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr

Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Combust  
Cooley  
Cox  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremins  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLay  
Diaz-Balart  
Dixon  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Ewing  
Fawell  
Fields (TX)  
Flanagan  
Foley  
Forbes  
Fowler  
Fox  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Goss  
Graham  
Gunderson  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert

Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Ingalls  
Istook  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Largent  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Linder  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Longley  
Lucas  
Manzullo  
Martini  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Molinaro  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Myrick  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oxley  
Packard

NAYS—179

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Coleman  
Andrews  
Baesler  
Baldacci  
Barcia  
Barrett (WI)  
Barton  
Becerra  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Bryant (TX)  
Cardin  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement

Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Danner  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doyle  
Edwards  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)

Parker  
Paxon  
Petri  
Pombo  
Porter  
Portman  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Riggs  
Roberts  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Roukema  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Saxton  
Scarborough  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Talent  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Watts (OK)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Wolf  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Filner  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Furse  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gonzalez  
Gordon  
Green  
Gutierrez  
Hall (OH)  
Hamilton  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Hefner  
Hilliard  
Hinchey  
Holden  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jacobs

Jefferson  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnston  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klink  
Kluczk  
LaFalce  
Lantos  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lincoln  
Lipinski  
Lofgren  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Markey  
Martinez  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McDermott  
McHale  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Miller (CA)

Minge  
Mink  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Neal  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pastor  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pomeroy  
Poshard  
Rahall  
Reed  
Richardson  
Rivers  
Roemer  
Rose  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sawyer  
Schroeder

Schumer  
Serrano  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Studds  
Stupak  
Tanner  
Taylor (MS)  
Tejeda  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Thurman  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Waxman  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Woolsey  
Yates

## NOT VOTING—14

Chapman  
Collins (IL)  
de la Garza  
Dickey  
Durbin

Greenwood  
Lowey  
Moakley  
Myers  
Pelosi

Rangel  
Royce  
Scott  
Stokes

□ 1200

Messrs. BOUCHER, HOLDEN, DICKS, CRAMER, RICHARDSON, ANDREWS, and BARCIA changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the joint resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that had I been here for rollcall No. 62, I would have voted "nay." I was detained at a Committee on Appropriations hearing, and, therefore, I missed the vote.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I was also detained at the Committee on Appropriations. Had I been present for the vote I would have voted "nay."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have the same request. I was unavoidably detained in my subcommittee and could not make it here at the time. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 336, noes 73, answered "present" 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

## AYES—336

Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Armedy  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilirakis  
Bishop  
Bliley  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambliss  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coburn  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooley  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Cremeans  
Cubin  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
Deal  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dickey  
Dicks

Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Ewing  
Farr  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Flake  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frisa  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Gallegly  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Geren  
Gilchrest  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Herger  
Hinckley  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Ingalls  
Istook  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee (TX)  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones

Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecza  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaHood  
Lantos  
Largent  
LaTourette  
Lazio  
Leach  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBiondo  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCormack  
McCrery  
McDade  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
Meehan  
Meek  
Metcalfe  
Meyers  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Minge  
Mink  
Molinari  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Obey  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Oxley  
Packard  
Parker  
Pastor  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi

Peterson (FL)  
Petri  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Sanders  
Sanford  
Sawyer  
Scarborough

Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schumer  
Scott  
Seastrand  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stearns  
Studds  
Stump  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda

Thomas  
Thornberry  
Thurman  
Tiahrt  
Torres  
Towns  
Traffant  
Upton  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wynn  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

## NOES—73

Abercrombie  
Baldacci  
Becerra  
Borski  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Clay  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Costello  
DeFazio  
English  
Ensign  
Everett  
Fazio  
Filner  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Frost  
Gephardt  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Green  
Gutknecht  
Hastings (FL)

Hefley  
Heineman  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hutchinson  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson, E.B.  
Kennelly  
LaFalce  
Latham  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Longley  
Markey  
McDermott  
McNulty  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Oliver  
Owens  
Pallone  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pombo

Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Schroeder  
Skaggs  
Slaughter  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stockman  
Taylor (MS)  
Thompson  
Thornton  
Torkildsen  
Torricelli  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Wise  
Yates  
Zimmer

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Harman

## NOT VOTING—21

Barr  
Bilbray  
Blute  
Chapman  
Collins (IL)  
de la Garza  
Dellums

Durbin  
Gutierrez  
Hefner  
Laughlin  
Lewis (CA)  
Menendez  
Moakley

Myers  
Neal  
Radanovich  
Saxton  
Skelton  
Stokes  
Wilson

□ 1220

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 956, COMMON SENSE PRODUCT LIABILITY LEGAL REFORM ACT OF 1996

Mr. HYDE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 956) to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for other purposes:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-481)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 956), to establish legal standards and procedures for product liability litigation, and for