

to India at a mere \$729,000. You want to talk travel?

Why do we not start with the Secretary of Energy? Because I think it is timely when you are laying off Federal employees because your President will not sign a budget, he vetoes appropriations bills, when his Secretary of Energy could just about single-handedly balance the Federal budget by just cutting out her travel expenses for 1 month.

COOPERATION URGED IN BALANCING BUDGET

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I think the important thing is that we still retain some civility and some comity and not allow ourselves to denigrate the situation, because the American public demands that we represent all the people. I think that we try to dig down deep and get inside and try to represent all the people, not just the Democrats or Republicans or Independents but to represent all the people.

I supported a balanced budget in 7 years that was scored by CBO but it did not have the tax breaks that were put forward by the majority because we decided to put the money back into Medicare, back into Medicaid, student loans, and the environment.

I would like to work together with the majority to fashion a balanced budget over 7 years scored by CBO so that we can all be proud of that and work together in that regard, and I think that we can do that.

I reach my hand out to do that with my friends on the other side.

FAILED SYSTEM RESULTS IN LITTLE GIRL'S DEATH

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, this participation may well seem out of order for all that we have done today and all the finger-pointing and accusations.

I rise to speak about a little girl who was killed by her own mother in New York City. Her name is Elisa Izquierdo. The fact is that the system failed and that we failed.

There is a paper that I would share with Members later, but it finally ends,

Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must get tougher with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?

The paper referred to follows:

[From Time, Dec. 11, 1995]

SPARE US THE CHEAP GRACE

(By Jonathan Kozol)

It is hard to say what was more shocking about the death of Elisa Izquierdo—the end-

less savagery inflicted on her body and mind, or the stubborn inaction of the New York City agencies that were repeatedly informed of her peril. But while the murder of Elisa by her mother is appalling, it is hardly unexpected. In the death zones of America's postmodern ghetto, stripped of jobs and human services and sanitation, plagued by AIDS, tuberculosis, pediatric asthma and endemic clinical depression, largely abandoned by American physicians and devoid of the psychiatric services familiar in most middle-class communities, deaths like these are part of a predictable scenario.

After the headlines of recrimination and pretended shock wear off, we go back to our ordinary lives. Before long, we forget the victims' names. They weren't our children or the children of our neighbors. We do not need to mourn them for too long. But do we have the right to mourn at all? What does it mean when those whom we elect to public office cut back elemental services of life protection for poor children and then show up at the victim's funeral to pay condolence to the relatives and friends? At what point do those of us who have the power to prevent these deaths forfeit the entitlement of mourners?

It is not as if we do not know what might have saved some of these children's lives. We know that intervention programs work when well-trained social workers have a lot of time to dedicate to each and every child. We know that crisis hot lines work best when half of their employees do not burn out and quit each year, and that social workers do a better job when records are computerized instead of being piled up, lost and forgotten on the floor of a back room. We know that when a drug-addicted mother asks for help, as many mothers do, it is essential to provide the help she needs without delay, not after a waiting period of six months to a year, as is common in poor urban neighborhoods.

All these remedies are expensive, and we would demand them if our own children's lives were at stake. And yet we don't demand them for poor children. We wring our hands about the tabloid stories. We castigate the mother. We condemn the social worker. We churn out the familiar criticisms of "bureaucracy" but do not volunteer to use our cleverness to change it. Then the next time an election comes, we vote against the taxes that might make prevention programs possible, while favoring increased expenditures for prisons to incarcerate the children who survive the worst that we have done to them and grow up to be dangerous adults.

What makes this moral contradiction possible?

Can it be, despite our frequent protestations to the contrary, that our society does not particularly value the essential human worth of certain groups of children? Virtually all the victims we are speaking of are very poor black and Hispanic children. We have been told that our economy no longer has much need for people of their caste and color. Best-selling authors have, in recent years, assured us for their limited intelligence and low degree of "civilizational development." As a woman in Arizona said in regard to immigrant kids from Mexico, "I didn't breed them. I don't want to feed them"—a sentiment also heard in reference to Black children on talk-radio stations in New York and other cities. "Put them over there," a Black teenager told me once, speaking of the way he felt that he and other blacks were viewed by our society. "Pack them tight. Don't think about them. Keep your hands clean. Maybe they'll kill each other off."

I do not know how many people in our nation would confess such contemplations, which offend the elemental mandates of our cultural beliefs and our religions. No matter

how severely some among us may condemn the parents of the poor, it has been in axiom of faith in the U.S. that once a child is born, all condemnations are to be set aside. If we now have chosen to betray this faith, what consequences will this have for our collective spirit, for our soul as a society?

There is an agreeable illusion, evidenced in much of the commentary about Elisa, that those of us who witness the abuse of innocence—so long as we are standing at a certain distance—need not feel complicit in these tragedies. But this is the kind of ethical exemption that Dietrich Bonhoeffer called "cheap grace." Knowledge carries with it certain theological imperatives. The more we know, the harder it becomes to grant ourselves exemption. "Evil exists," a student in the South Bronx told me in the course of a long conversation about ethics and religion in the fall of 1993. "Somebody has power. Pretending that they don't so they don't need to use it to help people—that is my idea of evil."

Like most Americans, I do not tend to think of society that has been good to me and to my parents as "evil." But when he said that "somebody has power," it was difficult to disagree. It is possible that icy equanimity and a self-pacifying form of moral abdication by the powerful will take more lives in the long run than any single drug-addicted and disordered parent. Elisa Izquierdo's mother killed only one child. The seemingly anesthetized behavior of the U.S. Congress may kill thousands. Now we are told we must "get tougher" with the poor. How much tougher can we get with children who already have so little? How cold is America prepared to be?

AIYEE, KREPLACH

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, what we are doing right now reminds me of the story of the little boy in Lithuania who hated kreplach. No matter how many times his mother made it, he just hated it.

Finally his mother decided that she would just take kreplach apart and show him that all the parts of it were not bad.

She took out the sausage and fed him the sausage. "Don't you like sausage?" He said yes.

She took out some onions and sliced them up. "Don't you like onions?" Yes.

She took out some carrots, gave him some carrots, he said "yes."

She gave him some broccoli, he ate the broccoli, not too bad.

Then she put it all together, stirred it together, put it on the plate, and the boy said, "Aiye, kreplach."

So the Republicans start off the day and they say, "We don't like the Government."

We take it apart. We say, "How about small business assistance?" They say, "We like that."

"How about nursing home protection?"

"Well, we like that."

"How about a little extra money for crime protection?"

"Well, we like that."

"How about some money for NIH?"

"Well, let's put that back in."

But we stir it all together, we put it together, we say, "It's the government." They go, "Aiye, kreplach."

Let us hope when we bring it back out here on the floor in one big package, we could get out of here tonight without all your members shouting, "Aiye, kreplach."

NATIONAL DEBATE ON GOVERNMENT'S DIRECTION IS HEALTHY

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to follow such an accomplished speaker as the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I rise this evening to say that I am not really appalled at any of the discussion that has taken place on the floor of this House throughout this year. There has been a lot of acrimony on both parties' parts. But the purpose that we are here, and it is not surprising, that when one party has controlled the Government for 40 years and we are trying to move in a new direction, it is not surprising that there is going to be heated debate and there is going to be intense disagreement on where we are going.

That is the purpose of this House, and that is the purpose of a democracy, to have a national debate about the changes that we need to make.

I am delighted to be a part of this discussion. I think that it is healthy that we have this intense disagreement, because we can either continue down the path we have been moving of a large Government with higher taxes and more Government programs, or we can move in a direction of a more limited Government with less taxes and a more reasonable approach to Government.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EMERSON). The Chair had previously announced that 1-minute would be entertained until business presented itself. Business now presents itself, so we will suspend 1-minute and may at some point come back to them.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1358, CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE LABORATORY AT GLOUCESTER, MA

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-449) on the resolution (H. Res. 338) providing for the disposition of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1358) to require the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory located on Emerson Avenue in Gloucester, MA, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR DISPOSITION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1358, CONVEYANCE OF NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE LABORATORY AT GLOUCESTER, MA

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 338 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 338

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1358) to require the Secretary of Commerce to convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts the National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory located on Emerson Avenue in Gloucester, Massachusetts, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution.

The text of the Senate amendment and the House amendment to the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCES.

(a) NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES SERVICE LABORATORY AT GLOUCESTER, MASSACHUSETTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall convey to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property comprising the National Marine Fisheries Service laboratory located on Emerson Avenue in Gloucester, Massachusetts.

(2) TERMS.—A conveyance of property under paragraph (1) shall be made—

(A) without payment of consideration; and
(B) subject to the terms and conditions specified under paragraphs (3) and (4).

(3) CONDITIONS FOR TRANSFER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of any conveyance of property under this subsection, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts shall assume full responsibility for maintenance of the property for as long as the Commonwealth retains the right and title to that property.

(B) CONTINUED USE OF PROPERTY BY NMFS.—The Secretary may enter into a memorandum of understanding with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under which the National Marine Fisheries Service is authorized to occupy existing laboratory space on the property conveyed under this subsection, if—

(i) the term of the memorandum of understanding is for a period of not longer than 5 years beginning on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(ii) the square footage of the space to be occupied by the National Marine Fisheries Service does not conflict with the needs of, and is agreeable to, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

(4) REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—All right, title, and interest in and to all property conveyed under this subsection shall revert to the United States on the date on which the Commonwealth of Massachusetts uses any of the property for any purpose other than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Division of

Marine Fisheries resource management program.

(5) RESTRICTION.—Amounts provided by the South Essex Sewage District may not be used by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to transfer existing activities to, or conduct activities at, property conveyed under this section.

(b) PIER IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA.—Section 22(a) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act Amendments of 1994 (Public Law 103-238; 108 Stat. 561) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" before "Not"; and
(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(2) Not later than December 31, 1996, the Secretary of the Navy may convey, without payment or other consideration, to the Secretary of Commerce, all right, title, and interest to the property comprising that portion of the Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, bounded by Hobson Avenue, the Cooper River, the landward extension of the property line located 70 feet northwest of and parallel to the centerline of Pier Q, and the northwest property line of the parking area associated with Pier R. The property shall include Pier Q, all towers and out-buildings on that property, and walkways and parking areas associated with those buildings and Pier Q."

SEC. 2. FISHERIES RESEARCH FACILITIES.

(a) FORT JOHNSON.—The Secretary of Commerce, through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, is authorized to construct on land to be leased from the State of South Carolina, a facility at Fort Johnson, South Carolina, provided that the annual cost of leasing the required lands does not exceed one dollar.

(b) AUKE CAPE.—The Secretary of Commerce, through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere, is authorized to construct a facility on Auke Cape near Juneau, Alaska, to provide consolidated office and laboratory space for National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration personnel in Juneau, provided that the property for such facility is transferred to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration from the United States Coast Guard or the City of Juneau.

(c) COMPLETION DATE FOR FUNDED WORK.—The Secretary of Commerce shall complete the architectural and engineering work for the facilities described in subsections (a) and (b) by not later than May 1, 1996, using funds that have been previously appropriated for that work.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.—The authorizations contained in subsections (a) and (b) are subject to the availability of appropriations provided for the purpose stated in this section.

SEC. 3. PRIBILOF ISLANDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall, subject to the availability of appropriations provided for the purposes of this section, clean up landfills, wastes, dumps, debris, storage tanks, property, hazardous or unsafe conditions, and contaminants, including petroleum products and their derivatives, left by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration on lands which it and its predecessor agencies abandoned, quitclaimed, or otherwise transferred or are obligated to transfer, to local entities or residents on the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, pursuant to the Fur Seal Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 1151 et seq.), as amended, or other applicable law.

(b) OBLIGATIONS OF SECRETARY.—In carrying out cleanup activities under subsection (a), the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) to the maximum extent practicable, execute agreements with the State of Alaska, and affected local governments, entities,