

still a question for the House how and when and under what procedure it shall be done
* * *

Speaker Gillett's ruling is fully recorded in Cannon's Precedents, at volume 6, section 48.

Applying the precedent of 1921 and the others just cited, the Chair holds that the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas does not affect "the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, [or] the integrity of its proceedings" within the meaning of clause 1 of rule IX. Rather, it proposes to effect a special order of business for the House—deeming it to have passed two legislative measures—as an antidote for the alleged discredit of previous inaction thereon. The resolution does not constitute a question of privilege under rule IX.

To rule that a question of the privileges of the House under rule IX may be raised by allegations of perceived discredit brought upon the House by legislative action or inaction, would permit any Member to allege an impact on the dignity of the House based upon virtually any legislative action or inaction.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the journal stands approved.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

THE BORDER PATROL IN FLORIDA

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to address the House on a problem we are having in Florida and we are having all across the Nation. Last evening we had a chance to hear the President deliver his speech on the future of America. One of the things he emphasized was on changing and enforcing immigration procedures in our country.

It is ironic that this past week the Immigration and Naturalization Service announced that it was taking eight

Border Patrol agents from Florida and moving them to the southwest border of the United States. Clearly I know that we are having extraordinary problems on the borders of Mexico, but Florida also is being inundated by illegal immigrants.

What has happened with our Border Patrol has been a diminishing from 85 agents in 1988 to half that strength of 42 agents today, after these agents are detailed to the southwest border. In my home district, the Palm Beach Border Patrol Office will shrink to just three agents and one supervisor who are responsible for covering eight counties and 120 miles of coastline. At the same time, the number of Border Patrol and Coast Guard interceptions of Cubans and Haitians for the first 2 months of 1996 fiscal year, 1,248 interceptions, is almost as high as the total number of interceptions for the entire 1995 fiscal year, which totaled 1,789 interceptions—1,248 in 2 months, 1,789 during the whole fiscal year of 1995.

Just yesterday Border Patrol agents arrested eight illegals who were working at a school construction site in West Palm Beach, FL. The total number of criminal alien apprehensions in the Miami sector last year totaled 1,857 people, criminal alien apprehensions in the Miami sector. These statistics clearly demonstrate the critical need for a stronger Border Patrol force in Florida, so it amazes me that the INS apparently ignores this data making policy decisions.

I fully support a strong Border Patrol force for the entire United States, but not by slashing the number of Florida agents. I had a chance to go out with the gentleman from California, Mr. GALLEGLY, and others, the gentleman from California, DUKE CUNNINGHAM, and survey the border of Mexico. I understand their problem. I wholeheartedly support strengthening our enforcement on the border. However, Florida, much like California, Texas, and Arizona, has a similar problem. It is simply insane to remove agents from a State like Florida which continues to be strained by illegal immigration, insane.

Ironically, the day after the announcement to detail Florida agents, the Center for Immigration Studies released a new report stating that Florida remains the third largest recipient of illegal immigrants, with one of nine illegal immigrants in the United States residing in Florida. In fact, the report suggests that the illegal immigrant population in our State could be as high as 450,000 today. The State of Florida estimates that in 1993 alone, State and local governments have spent around \$884 million on undocumented aliens.

In addition, there are approximately 5,504 criminal aliens in State correction facilities on any given day, costing Florida taxpayers on average \$14,000 per inmate annually, 5,504 illegals in our State prison system, 5,504 beds that could be made available

for rapists, murderers, and drug dealers. The INS decision to cut Florida Border Patrol agents further erodes our already limited resources and threatens the security of our borders.

In fact, by INS taking eight agents out of Florida, they have in fact said "Welcome, one and all. Come to the State, because we are no longer enforcing the laws of this land." The action sends the wrong message to illegal immigrants, and it is simply not in the best interests of the State of Florida nor of the United States of America.

If, Mr. Speaker, the President is serious about changing the way Government operates in Washington, if we are in fact talking about the State of the Union of this country, the State of the Union of this country, then one of our most important challenges is to protect and secure our borders from illegal entry.

I welcome people to this country. My grandmother came from Poland. She had a sponsored job waiting and a clean bill of health. I want people who come to this country with a clear indication of wanting to support the values we hold dear. I commend you, Mr. President, for your speech. I commend the enthusiasm by which you lead this country. I urge you and I urge our leadership to sit down and work the details out of all the problems we face, but if we are in fact to have a safe and free Nation, we must protect ourselves from illegal immigration.

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

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

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

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

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

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

DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this morning during my 1-minute speech, I chastised the Speaker of the House, NEWT GINGRICH, for not telling exactly the truth this morning on one of the talk show programs when he was being interviewed

in regard to President Clinton's State of the Union Message last night, because Speaker GINGRICH said, in answer to a question as to whether the President was really for welfare reform, that the President had vetoed welfare reform twice and that one time he had vetoed a bill that had passed the Senate by 85 votes.

Now, when I brought out this morning that that bill, that bill that the President vetoed, had only gotten 52 votes in the Senate, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] got in the well and said, well that is the same bill; that that bill got 87 votes in September and it got 52 votes in December.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS], it is not the same bill. I think the gentleman should learn legislative procedure. The bill that passed the Senate had different provisions in it. There were changes made in conference. When the bill went to the President, it was changed vastly from the bill that had passed the Senate with those 87 votes. That is why Members who had voted for it, even Republican Members who had voted for it in September would not vote for it in December, and that is why the President vetoed it.

I will go back, Mr. Speaker. Speaker GINGRICH should know the facts. The facts are that that bill only got 52 votes in the Senate; it did not get 85 votes in the Senate and never did, and it barely passed the Senate because there were 47 votes against it. Two Republicans even voted against it.

Now, if we really want welfare reform, we need to sit down and work together. We are not that far apart; we should do welfare reform. We need to do a balanced budget. We heard the President last night. He says, there are a lot of areas, and I agree, there are a lot of areas where both the Democrats, the President and the Republicans agree that we can make changes and reduce the deficit in future years. He said, let us do those. But that is not what we heard from this well this morning.

The President held out his hand to work together. The Republicans have thrown it back and said: No, we are not going to do that. We are going to do it our way or no way.

That is probably what we will have, is no way. That is what is wrong with this Government and this Congress today.

There are many things that need to be done, and little has been done, so little that this congress will go down in history as the most do-nothing Congress since 1933.

Mr. Speaker, it is very interesting that this Congress in its first session worked for 365 days, had more votes than at any time in the near past Congresses, spent more hours working, but did less. A total of either 88 or 89 bills actually became law. We have not had that few since 1933, folks. Every Congress before this, immediate Congresses, the 1st session of the 103d, the

2d session of the 103d, the 102d, the 100th, the 99th, the 98th; even with Democrats under Bush we did more than this Congress. This Congress, if we really want to know, is a do-nothing Congress.

There was a great bit of fanfare a year ago right here on this floor, and it started on the 4th of January last year. It lasted for 100 days, of all of this great legislation that is going to change this country. I remember the Speaker standing down here and clipping those little cards every time a bill would pass. He would stand here and clip that little card.

Somebody better tell the Speaker and the majority that just because the House passes a bill, it does not do anything. It does not become law, it does not make one change. They act like all these changes were taking place. It has to go through the Senate. And what happened when those bills got over to the Senate? Well, we can go down the history of it and find that the majority over in the Senate, who are the same party, said no; they are too radical. No, those bills are too extreme. We are not going to do that radical approach to change in the Government.

HOLOCAUST: THE CHINA PARALLEL

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

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I spoke earlier, and I just want to take a little time after the 1-minute to really urge Members to get a copy of the Washington Post piece by Walter Reich called, "Holocaust: The China Parallel."

The writer is a physician, the director of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum. He points out that what is taking place in China is parallel to the Holocaust that took place in some respects in Nazi Germany. Now, this Congress last year was going to do something with regard to China. It passed a bill with regard to putting some restrictions on China and dealing with Radio Free China. Frankly, nothing has happened to it. This year the Congress I think is obligated on both sides of the aisle to do something to deal with the issues of religious persecution and what is taking place in China.

As a couple of examples, and I will submit them for the RECORD, Freedom House has documented 200 Christian Leaders in prison since April 1, 1995. A Christian ministry in the United States had delegates recently to visit a house church during a recent visit to China. The leaders in these churches have to be itinerant in their own country. They cannot meet with their own families. They have no permanent home. Many leaders have been jailed, beaten, fined, tortured, or sent to labor or reeducation camps for their religious beliefs.

Quite frankly, I wish that Ronald Reagan were back in the White House

whereby we could have somebody who could come out and stand up and raise these issues. Frankly, since the Berlin Wall has fallen and since Ronald Reagan has left the White House, neither the administration, the Bush administration, nor the Clinton administration, nor Republican Congresses or Democratic Congresses, have done anything with regard to human rights in China and many of the other countries.

Quite frankly, the business of the Clinton administration is business. It is not human rights. They do not care if Catholic priests are being persecuted and bishops are going to jail. They don't care if evangelical ministers are being put in prison. They don't care if Buddhists are being put in prison.

Mr. Speaker, does the Congress care? We know that Clinton does not care. We know that Secretary Christopher does not care, because we have seen no action out of the State Department. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the sound of silence that has come from the Clinton administration on religious persecution is deafening. Mr. Speaker, to be fair, the sound of silence coming from the Republican Congress on this issue is deafening.

Now, all one had to do was watch "60 Minutes" Sunday night where they showed Chinese children tied to beds, mainly female children, and they starved them to death, similar to what the Nazis did before World War II. Had that happened in the 1980's, had Ronald Reagan been able to see that, had Senator Jackson of Jackson-Vanick been able to see it, leaders who have fought on both sides of the aisle for human rights, this Congress would have passed a resolution on it. This Congress would have debated this issue. But frankly, Mr. Speaker, this Congress, along with the Clinton administration, has done absolutely nothing.

It would be my hope and prayer that both parties would have a plank in their platform this year for religious freedom from dissidents around the world, for persecution of all religious beliefs, whether they be Buddhist or Christian or Jews. This issue should be on the forefront of the burner of both political parties.

As I again urge my colleagues after they read the article in today's Washington Post, I will close with what the author said. He said, "If the Human Rights Watch report can be verified by international inspections, the parallels between the Chinese orphanages and the Nazi programs that killed disabled children are alarming. These parallels remind us that human beings, including physicians and other caregivers, are extraordinarily vulnerable to inhuman acts and extraordinarily capable for justifying their behavior on what they see as rational grounds. And they remind us that countries in which democratic institutions are forcibly forbidden and human rights systematically quashed are ones in which human life becomes, quite simply, expendable."