

provisions and bogged down in complicated processes. Today, we have another chance to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] has been out there trying to urge that we move this bill as a freestanding measure and get it to the President as quickly as possible, and I know that he joins with me and many others in hoping that this time the legislative journey will have its final destination on the President's desk.

The millions of people whose lives are touched each day by devastating tragedies that result from traumatic brain injuries need to know that we care about them and we will try to help them.

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

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 249, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 248.

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

There was no objection.

COST OF GOVERNMENT DAY

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 193) expressing the sense of the Congress that the cost of Government spending and regulatory programs should be reduced so that American families will be able to keep more of what they earn.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 193

Whereas the total of Government spending and regulations (total cost of Government) has increased from 48.2 percent of the net national product (NNP) in 1989 to an estimated 50.4 percent of NNP in 1996;

Whereas the total cost of Government now exceeds \$3,380,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas Federal regulatory costs now exceed \$730,000,000,000 annually;

Whereas the cost of Government in general and excessive regulations in particular have placed a tremendous drain on the economy in recent years by reducing worker productivity, increasing prices to consumers, and increasing unemployment;

Whereas if the average American worker were to spend all of his or her gross earnings

on nothing else besides meeting his or her share of the total cost of Government for the current year, that total cost would not be met until July 3, 1996;

Whereas July 3, 1996, should therefore be considered Cost of Government Day 1996; and

Whereas it is not right that the American family has to give up more than 50 percent of what it earns to the government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that, as part of balancing the budget and reevaluating the role of government, Federal, State, and local elected officials should carefully consider the cost of Government spending and regulatory programs in the year to come so that American families will be able to keep more of what they earn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to strongly support a resolution introduced by Congressman DELAY and 37 other original cosponsors. This resolution expresses a sense of Congress that Government officials should carefully consider the costs of Government and reduce those costs so that Americans will be able to keep more of their income. This is something I believe we all can and should support.

The timing of this resolution is appropriate since last week on July 3, 1996, was the Cost of Government Day. What does that mean? It means that if the average American worker were to spend all of their gross earnings on nothing else besides meeting his or her share of the total costs of Government, then this amount would not be paid off until July 3, 1996. At a time when private industry is rightsizing and becoming more efficient, we are also looking to the Federal Government to do the same.

The facts speak for themselves. The total cost of Government is estimated at \$3.38 trillion. That's \$13,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. Federal income tax receipts from individual income taxes are more than 13 times the size they were in 1960. The Federal regulatory burden that private businesses and citizens must shoulder is estimated to be over \$400 billion a year. We also recognize that the Federal Government should be performing only essential functions; however, we have seen the Government continue to mushroom. In 1985, there were 1,013 Federal programs; today there are 1,390 Federal programs administered by 53 Federal entities.

However, even more troubling is the billions of wasted tax dollars. It is estimated that about 10 percent of every health care dollar in this country is lost due to fraud and abuse. Using that assumption, it is estimated that combined total losses for Medicare and Medicaid due to fraud amount to ap-

proximately \$32.6 billion, or \$89 million each day. We must put a stop to this kind of wasteful hemorrhaging of our precious tax dollars and I am hopeful that health reform legislation will be enacted shortly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize that the Republican led Congress has been keenly aware of the need to rightsize the Federal Government. In fact, this issue has been the major focus of our agenda from day one of the 104th Congress.

Without a Republican led Congress, we would never have passed line-item veto authority which provides the President with the power to eliminate unnecessary Federal spending.

Without a Republican led Congress, we would never have had unfunded mandates legislation enacted which will prevent the Federal Government and Congress from imposing new requirements on State and local governments without the necessary funds. This should help with lessening the burden on State and local governments and in turn ease State and local tax increases.

Without a Republican led Congress, we would never have had the Small Business Regulatory Fairness Act which now provides for congressional review of major regulations to ensure that they make sense.

Without a Republican led Congress, we would never have had a complete overhaul of the Federal procurement system to allow the Government to cut through unnecessary redtape and increase efficiencies in purchasing goods and services to save the Government billions.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on but the point is that this Republican led Congress is committed to ensuring that taxpayers will be able to keep more of what they earn. We have proven that we can do just that. It is important to note that many of these initiatives have been supported in a very bipartisan manner.

This resolution is important because it reaffirms that message. Many of us on both sides of the aisle are deeply troubled that this Government costs too much. It is time to put our money where it belongs—back into the pockets of taxpayers. I urge that every Member support this resolution and show our commitment to a less expensive but more effective Government.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I know that the chairman of the committee is disappointed that the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS] is not able to be here, but I am sure the gentleman wants me to share with him what the gentlewoman have said had she been here.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution was never considered in the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, so we never had an opportunity to discuss it or amend it. It was put on today's

calendar apparently because the Republican leadership wants to show that they want to reduce Government spending and the size of government.

I have to say that after reading the text of the resolving clause, there is little with which anyone in Congress would disagree. All of us were elected to carefully consider every bill we pass, whether it is a spending bill, a tax bill, or a regulatory bill. We don't need a resolution to tell us to do our job.

In fact, the deficit has been going down every year under President Clinton. The difference between our two parties has been in our priorities. We have attempted to protect spending on important areas such as education, health care and the environment, while others have pursued spending cuts without considering their human costs.

Had we agreed to carefully consider every bill that spends money, we probably would not be considering this resolution today, because it is a waste of taxpayer dollars. The printing of this resolution and the printing of this debate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is a waste of spending.

We should instead be doing exactly what the resolution calls for—carefully considering appropriations bills, which should have all been passed by the House last month. Instead, we are woefully behind in the appropriations process, as we were last year, in part because we are wasting our time on resolutions like this.

Had the bill been considered in the committee, we might have considered some amendments. For example, instead of just considering the costs of regulation, we might also have resolved to carefully consider the benefits of regulation. However, I am not surprised that the sponsor of this resolution does not care to consider the benefits of regulation. He has sponsored a bill to repeal the Clean Air Act. In sponsoring that bill, did he consider the benefits of clean air?

The chief sponsor of this resolution also was the chief sponsor of a bill last year that passed the House. It would have imposed a yearlong moratorium on all new regulations, such as the recently adopted meat inspection regulation. That regulation, which will require testing for deadly bacteria, could save hundreds of lives and prevent thousands of diseases, but the gentleman's bill would have stopped the regulation in its tracks. Fortunately, the Senate refused to go along with the extremist antiregulatory bill.

As Nancy Donley, whose son died of the deadly *E. coli* bacteria in a hamburger, said last week when the new rule was adopted, we must understand that all regulations are not bad. However, this resolution would have us only carefully consider the costs of regulation, and not the benefits.

The same Republican sponsors of this resolution also attempted to cut the regulatory budget of the Environmental Protection Agency by a third. Perhaps they were carefully consider-

ing the costs of regulation, but I doubt they were carefully considering the costs to public health and the environment from their reckless cuts.

Earlier this year, the Republican sponsors of this resolution would have required every agency to hold a new rulemaking to re promulgate all of their existing regulations. That proposal would have added billions in regulatory costs, but the sponsors of that bill apparently wanted to let polluters continue to pollute while the agencies were tied up in knots re promulgating their existing regulations.

Soon we will be considering appropriations bills that will make large cuts in the President's budget for education. While the House considers the costs of these spending bills, as it should, I would expect it to also consider the costs of not adequately spending on our children's education.

When we had military spending bills before us this year, we had rules that prevented us from cutting spending, even for weapons that the Pentagon did not ask for. If we are committing ourselves to carefully consider Government spending, defense spending bills should not be immune to cost-cutting.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the antienvironment, antiregulatory, extreme agenda in this House will come to a close soon. It appears to have run out of steam. All that is left of it for the time being is this silly resolution that says Congress should carefully consider the costs of Government spending and regulatory programs.

It is about time that this Congress began to carefully consider all of its bills. We constantly face bills that have never been considered in committee, and this is one of them. Fortunately, it is just a resolution, and it is innocuous. Its worse crime is that it is a waste of our time and the taxpayer money.

Its attempt to designate July 3, 1996 as "Cost of Government Day" is already out of date. Apparently the rule that ended bills to designate days of the year for certain worthwhile causes, such as charities to cure diseases, does not apply to resolutions designating days for Republican propaganda purposes.

I would urge my Republican colleagues to stop wasting time on meaningless resolutions and get on with the Nation's business. We have appropriations bills as far as the eye can see, and just a few weeks to complete our work. The American people want to see us complete the Nation's business without another Government shutdown. Resolutions such as this only distract us from the real work ahead of us.

□ 1445

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

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes and 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chairman for yielding time to me.

I am truly shocked by the gentleman from Virginia's remarks about calling this resolution an innocuous resolution. I think it gets to the crux of the matter of why we wanted to bring this resolution to the floor, to highlight to the American people something that obviously the Democrats think is insignificant, innocuous, does not mean anything, that the American family today started on July 4 working for itself. That is what this resolution is about. They know that. They are trying to cover it up.

For 40 years they have built the Federal Government to such a huge size and taking money from the American family that now we work until July 3 for the Federal Government and start on July 4 working for ourselves. No one is talking about their bad regulations. What we are talking about is rushing to regulations, rushing to judgment without cost-benefit analysis and taking a commonsense approach to regulations.

USA Today newspaper yesterday was talking about the number of kids that had been killed by airbags, airbags, rushed to put into cars without the kind of commonsense, thoughtful regulations that may have created an airbag system in cars that would not have killed those kids.

So I rise in support of this resolution. I think it is a very important resolution that shows the American people that the cost of government day is July 3. It is altogether appropriate that we let the American people know how much they are spending for their Government. This year the average American family did not gain its freedom from the cost of government until July 3. July 4 may have been the day that we celebrated the anniversary of our Declaration of Independence from British tyranny, but this year it was July 3 when Americans actually gained their freedom from paying off their own Government.

Thomas Jefferson once said, a wise and frugal government shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement and shall not take from the mouth the labor of bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.

My friends, while that description may sum up good government, it certainly does not describe our Federal Government. Far too often the Federal Government takes, through direct and indirect taxes, the bread the American people have earned. As a former small business owner, I have felt the very real sting of Federal regulations and its costs on my business.

More people need to realize that government is a cost of doing business. Government is also a cost to the American family. If you add up the cost of regulations and taxes on the local, State and Federal level, the average family involuntarily donates over 50 percent of its income to the government. Today one parent is forced to

work for the government while the other one works to support the family.

According to the Commerce Department figures, Federal, State and local governments last year consumed 31.3 percent of all national output, the highest level in the history of the United States. That is the real legacy of the Clinton administration: the tax trap; higher taxes on working families.

On the other hand, the Republican Congress has made great strides toward reducing the size and cost of government. This 104th Congress has already cut spending by \$43 billion. We have cut our staff by a third. We have passed legislation to reduce taxes on middle-class families. We have signed into law unfunded mandates reform. And we have enacted the Paperwork Reduction Act, and we have passed two balanced budgets, two balanced budgets, the first budgets that balance in a generation. We are moving in the right direction. In fact, 2 years ago it was 52 percent of a family's income. We have it down to 50 percent and moved the days back a day or two.

This resolution serves as a simple reminder that the Government is too big and it costs too much. So I urge my colleagues to vote for this resolution and to work with me to make the Government work better and at less cost to the American family.

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

Since the gentleman was shocked at the fact that we questioned this bill and suggested it was somewhat innocuous, I have to ask how the American people are better off for our having passed this resolution, particularly when its purpose is to designate July 3 as the "Cost of Government Day," this being July 9.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question. They are better off because most Americans do not realize that over 40 years we have built the Federal Government to the point that it takes 52 percent of their income to survive.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE], a member of the committee.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding the time.

I rise today in strong support of this concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the cost of government is too high and should be reduced. It is outrageous that Americans must now work until July 3 to pay for the cost of Federal, State, and local governments plus the cost of government regulatory redtape.

The total 1996 cost of the Government is \$3,381 billion. My goodness, that is \$13,000 for every man, woman, and child in America. In 1995, the University of Stanford Decisions and Ethics Center compiled data on the burden

of taxation on all households in the United States. The results of this study are shocking. According to Stanford, government depletes at least 45 to 60 percent of all income earned by individual households, regardless of income level.

But taxes are not the only cost of government. Regulations also impose financial burdens on Americans. According to the Washington University Center for the Study of American Business, rulemaking agencies of the Government employ almost 131,000 people, the highest level in American history, and a 28-percent jump from the 1983 level of 102,000. As we know in Massachusetts, new drug approvals can take upward of 15 years, denying needed therapies to patients who need them but also forcing our companies in biotechnology and other innovative sciences to lose the competitive edge that they need to compete with their European and Japanese competitors.

Mr. Speaker, some Americans are lucky enough to have a 40-hour work week. Indeed, this has become a luxury. But for the majority of Americans, the day begins earlier and earlier in the morning and ends later and later in the week. Why? So that American workers can make enough money to support two families. Yes, you have to support two: your own family plus Uncle Sam who has an uncontrollable appetite. That means that Americans will spend 184.6 days out of the entire year working for the government at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this concurrent resolution.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute and 15 seconds to suggest that there is good reason why America did not have the mad cow disease that occurred in Europe. In fact, we hear of so many things that occur in other countries that were prevented here. All we are asking is for a balance.

The majority whip, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], criticized the use of airbags in his speech. But he did not mention the number of lives that have been saved by the use of airbags. We think on this side of the aisle that the American people want things like airbags and we ought to present a balance.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BLUTE. Mr. Speaker, the majority whip was referring to the USA Today article yesterday which was very extensively researched. It was referring to the passenger-side airbags and the regulations that were imposed a number of years ago that were not well thought out, that was a rush to judgment in the bureaucratic mindset of some of our transportation officials and has been an unmitigated disaster for children and has killed far more children than it has saved. I think what we are saying is, we need regulations. We certainly do. They need to be well thought out.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, to clarify for the gentleman from Massachusetts, he is not suggesting nor is his side suggesting we ought not require airbags to be included in the manufacture of U.S. automobiles.

Mr. BLUTE. I am suggesting, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that we look at, for example, passenger-side airbags as to whether that is well thought out for the safety of our children in automobiles. It has been a disaster, as most observers have agreed, that that regulation was not well thought out.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes and 15 seconds to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], a member of the committee, chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the full committee for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, the Government costs—and the Government taxes that back up those costs—are spotlighted by July 3d as Cost of Government Day. These costs and taxes are siphoning money away from family resources. They are robbing millions of our citizens and those who want to be citizens of achieving the American dream.

The 104th Congress is working to give higher incomes and lower taxes to all Americans. We have eliminated more than 200 unnecessary Federal programs and agencies. We have downsized the Washington bureaucracy as well as the congressional bureaucracy. We have moved government funds and programs to the States, and hopefully they will be even further decentralized to the communities and counties where real life occurs and real government occurs.

Members of the 104th Congress approved a balanced budget plan, but it was vetoed by President Clinton.

We tried to provide tax relief to the middle class through a \$500 per child tax credit, but it was vetoed by President Clinton. We tried to provide marriage penalty relief and estate tax relief. We did get relief for seniors by phasing out the Social Security earnings limitation from which they have long suffered. We have tried to provide a deduction for families caring for elderly parents, an adoption tax credit, long-term care insurance tax reforms. Again, the President used his veto. He likes big government.

Our Nation was founded on the principle of working hard and enjoying the fruits of one's labors. But as seen by the Cost of Government Day, this is simply no longer true. Instead, our fellow taxpayers work over 6 months to pay the bills. Congress and the President must continue to rethink and work together to cut Government spending and many of our outdated regulatory programs. We must ensure that America's workers are able to keep more of what they earn.

I listened to my good friend from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] earlier claim that if

we had been in control of the executive branch and gotten our way, we would not have issued these recent regulations. Well, if my good friend will recall, since he and I are both members of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, we always had an exemption to issue health and safety regulations. The President was never limited in that area. If you can find some other health and safety things to do in the next couple of weeks, you can issue regulations whether our laws had been on the books or not.

I think my good friend will recall that health and safety regulations were exempt from the downsizing of many other regulations which, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BLUTE] said, were simply not well thought out. If the gentleman wonders if I am for airbags, you bet I am for airbags. I am for airbags that work, not just from the front but also from the side door. I want to protect the children as well as the parents.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HORN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised the gentleman is for airbags. He is a very thoughtful member of the committee and of this body. We did have an issue on meat and poultry inspection.

□ 1500

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues will recall that we have fought consistently to get decent standards for frozen chicken, which, when it is thawed and then frozen again, creates tremendous bacteria. The Department of Agriculture has a lower standard than the State of California. The Department of Agriculture does not want to accept the higher California standard. And guess who is most influential with the Department of Agriculture? It is known as Tyson's Foods.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to underscore a point that we have been trying to make, and I think it is consistent with some of the rhetoric that we have been hearing today. The gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] had an amendment that we would maintain our standards on meat and poultry inspection, which is a very relevant one, particularly when we see what has happened with mad cow disease in England and other situations that have endangered peoples' lives and health, and 220 Republicans voted against that amendment.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to respond, and I would underscore what the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] said, and that is that there is a clear exemption in the unfunded mandates law and others which says the President has the right to waive that where health and safety is involved and clearly can do that without being limited to the law.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding, and I appreciate the debate here on the floor today.

As I see it, in a nutshell, the problem is this: that our Government has gotten too big and our Government costs too much, and the American people have expressed that sentiment time and time again, and that is why I think this legislation before us, this resolution, is so important.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday our Nation celebrated its 220th birthday. We recalled the enormous sacrifices our Founding Fathers made to leave us a Nation founded on individual freedom. We remembered all the past generations of Americans who gave so much and suffered so much in many times and places to preserve this most precious legacy that we have.

Unfortunately, thanks to a government that has grown too big and costs too much, Americans also marked their first full freedom, day of freedom, from paying for the Federal Government, as July 3. After 185 long days Americans are finally able to work for themselves, not the Federal Government.

Today the total cost of government, that is Federal, State and local, in terms of spending and regulation, comes to more than \$3 trillion a year. Let me repeat that. The Federal, State and local government taxes costs the American people over \$3 trillion a year. Federal regulations alone, remember, Federal regulations alone, amounts to \$600 billion. That is more than we need to easily balance our budget.

This hidden regulatory tax costs each family in my congressional district \$6,000 of their hard-earned income each year, and this tax continues to rise. So for all the people in America, not only in mine, but for my colleagues' constituents, too, each household, \$6,000 a year for Federal regulations.

In fact, since November 14, 1994, this administration, the Clinton administration, has issued 4,300 new rules; 4,300 new rules since November 14, 1994. I just want to say that since November 14, 1994 this administration has issued 4,300 new rules, and no one has said that we need more rules. That is thousands and thousands of more pages of red tape for our small businesses. Remember, defunct businesses do not create jobs.

Finally, think of what a family could do with the extra \$6,000. Perhaps they could set aside some money for their sons' or daughters' college tuition. Perhaps they could afford their first new home, down payment for that. Perhaps they could open their own small business. The possibilities are endless.

It is time to lift the regulatory burden that is smothering the American dream. Excessive regulation is not only wasteful, it is mortally wrong. Now is the time, Congress, to act, because America is patiently waiting.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself a minute and a half.

Mr. Speaker, in the first place a lot of the regulations that have been cited

have not, in fact, been new regulations. They have been rescissions and modifications. That grandiose number is misleading because it would be implied that those are all new regulations. They certainly are not. But the fact is we do have too many regulations, and I personally believe that the Federal Government too often imposes cookie-cutter compliance on States and localities and private businesses.

I think we would be far better off if we moved to an outcome-based approach, particularly to environmental regulation where we told the private businesses and the States and localities: "This is the goal; we want you to achieve this in the most effective and efficient manner possible. But you know your demography, you know your geography, and we think that you have the best understanding as to how to reach this goal," and we do not really argue, I hope, on the goals of clean water and clean air and safe meat and poultry.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and he is more than gracious in yielding. I just pointed out the fact that the gentleman earlier was criticizing the moratorium on regulations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself another 2 minutes and yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, take time to look at the excessive regulations the gentleman just said that we ought to be looking at, and the gentleman was criticizing the riders on our appropriations bill last year that does exactly what the gentleman just said that we ought to be doing: set the standard allowing local and State governments and private industries to come up with the solutions.

That is all we are talking about.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I reclaim my time to explain our objection.

It was not an objection to reviewing many of our regulations, but we object to suspending those regulations in the meantime while we are reviewing them. We think that the American people want and need that kind of protection, but we also think that we should continue to be scrutinizing those regulations to make sure that they function in the most efficient reasonable manner possible.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. I am sure the gentleman does not want to mislead the people watching C-SPAN. The only moratorium we were talking about is suspending any new regulations, not suspending existing regulations.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, because I know he does not want to deceive the American people certainly, the fact is these regulations were up for reauthorization,

and they would have expired. That is why we needed to continue the regulations in effect while we were reviewing them.

But our principal point with regard to this resolution is that we should be balanced in the information we present to the American people. We ought to review the costs. Absolutely we ought to review how it is tying up States and localities and private businesses. But we also need to balance that with an estimate, an understanding of the benefits, so we give the American people the cost and the benefits, let them decide, and that is the way we can make the best judgment as well. This resolution does not address benefits; it only addresses the costs. And I think to act responsibly we need to look at both.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

I just want to underscore. I think this deserves bipartisan support, as the gentleman from Virginia said. I think we are in agreement that we have too many regulations, that they need to be carefully considered before we impose additional burdens on the American people. We have taken, I think, substantial steps in this direction with the passage of the unfunded mandates law, which passed overwhelmingly on a bipartisan basis, to suggest that there needs to be a close look taken to regulations that are imposing tremendous new, additional financial burden on States and local government. So this resolution really is in keeping with that.

I would suggest to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] that it is—I think our point has been in the past too often all we looked at was the benefit and all we looked at was what was proposed to be accomplished by that regulation. We never looked at the cost, and that was one of the things I think that has become a part of this now, is that we do try to take a balance.

Yes, sure, we have to consider what is going to be the impact on people, but we have to consider what the cost is going to be as well. I would hope that that is implicit in this resolution that we really do not have a balance. I would suggest that in the past we did not have that balance because the only thing that was required to be considered was the benefit to be derived from it.

So I would hope that this resolution would achieve broad bipartisan support, I think it should not be seen as a partisan measure at all.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Would it be possible to amend this to where it says in the third to last line, consider the costs and benefits of government spending, two words, and we can make all the Democrats happy?

Could we get unanimous consent to do that?

Mr. CLINGER. I do not believe that this can be amended on the floor.

Mr. MORAN. By unanimous consent, I am told, it can actually, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER].

Mr. CLINGER. I think, as I say, my view is that the resolution has drafted, and implicit in that is the fact that it would indeed cover, as the gentleman knows clearly, we are going to consider the benefits that are going to be derived from any resolution. So I would think that what this does is add the additional component that the costs should be considered as well.

Mr. MORAN. I hope we are not paranoid, but that was not our implicit assumption. It only refers to costs, but not benefits. If it included benefits, we will not have any problem whatsoever.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 193.

The question was taken.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 1515

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAW). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

THE MONTGOMERY GI BILL, THE ARMED FORCES' BEST RECRUITMENT TOOL

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, recently the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff stated that, "we remain committed to maintaining quality personnel, and recruiters from all Services have stated the Montgomery GI bill is the best recruitment tool they have."

I have had the great pleasure of serving on the Veterans' Affairs Committee with the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY, the principal author and sponsor of the newest GI bill. It is no surprise that the Department of Defense's latest evaluation of the Montgomery GI bill strongly supports this program's continuation. Sonny designed the new GI bill with great care and after extensive hearings which included more than 200 witnesses. Because of his careful attention to program structure, the Montgomery GI bill has been uniquely successful and has fulfilled all of its intended purposes. As noted in a recent report, the percentage of new recruits choosing to enroll in the GI bill has risen from 50 percent at the program's inception in 1985 to a remarkable 95 percent in fiscal year 1995. Since the implementation of the Montgomery GI bill, more than 2 million active-duty recruits have elected to participate in the program—vividly demonstrating the attractiveness of this GI bill to the young people entering the Armed Forces.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense notes that the percentage of GI bill participants who are using their benefits following military service continues to rise, from 40 percent in 1991 to 46 percent at the end of 1993. This is a promising and important trend, but we must continue to watch these numbers closely. We all want these men and women, who earn their education benefits through honorable military service, to make full use of their GI bill education assistance.

Regarding the adequacy of the Montgomery GI bill benefit as a recruitment incentive, the Department of Defense noted that during fiscal year 1995 all services met their recruiting objectives. Some 96 percent of new recruits were high school diploma graduates, 71 percent had above-average scores on the aptitude tests administered to new recruits, and fewer than 1 percent were in the lowest acceptable aptitude category. In spite of these impressive statistics, the Department of Defense cautions, "With recent recruiting successes, current basic benefits appear to be adequate as an enlistment incentive. However, if college costs, especially tuition and fees, continue to rise significantly above inflation, the offset provided by the Montgomery GI bill benefits will require close monitoring to keep the program competitive." I urge my colleagues to pay close attention to this serious concern raised by the Department of Defense. SONNY MONTGOMERY has struggled to keep the GI bill basic benefit competitive, and I hope to ensure that the program that carries his name is maintained and strengthened in the 105th Congress.

I know SONNY would want me to emphasize that the first and primary purpose of the Montgomery GI bill is to