

and, that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1871.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,

Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Thursday, June 12, 1997:

H.R. 1871. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for recovery from natural disasters, and for overseas peacekeeping efforts, including those in Bosnia, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1997, and for other purposes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF OFFICIAL OBJECTORS FOR PRIVATE CALENDAR, 105TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that the official objectors for the Private Calendar for the 105th Congress are as follows:

For the majority: Messrs. SENSENBRENNER, Wisconsin; COBLE, North Carolina; and GOODLATTE, Virginia.

For the minority: Mr. BOUCHER, Virginia, and Ms. DELAURO, Connecticut.

SPECIAL ORDERS

POLITICS AS USUAL BAD POLICY FOR FLOOD VICTIMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SCARBOROUGH] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend and over the past 3 or 4 weeks we have been hearing a lot on television about flood relief and the politicization of that process, and we have been hearing about how flood victims got caught in the middle of a political gambit and they have actually been upset and injured by politics as usual in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come to the floor today because I have been looking through some newspapers across the country to see what they were doing outside the beltway and I wanted to check into some of the charges that actually what happened on this flood relief bill actually did affect flood victims, because we get in Washington and one hears different things.

In fact, I heard the Vice President last week go before a press conference and say the following, and this is from the Philadelphia Inquirer dated last week: Vice President GORE accused the Republicans of issuing an ultimatum. Quote: "They are saying to the American people, we want to make it clear that we will hurt you unless these provisions are accepted."

The charge is almost frantic, that actually there were people in this Cham-

ber that wanted to hurt Americans if they did not go along with their own political agenda. It reminded me of some of the things that I heard in the past when the President and Vice President would come out to the press conference when we were trying to balance the budget and try to hide behind Medicare and try to scare senior citizens and talk about how we wanted to slash Medicare, when in fact we were trying to save Medicare and were putting out a proposal very similar to what the President was putting out.

There is this tactic that they always seem to use. Every time you start to nail them down and try to force them to be physically responsible, they would say, oh, you are trying to hurt old people, you are trying to hurt senior citizens, you are trying to hurt young children, you are trying to hurt flood victims. So it was sort of these scare tactics to try to stop us from doing what needed to be done.

During the flood relief bill, what some Members wanted to do was actually put in a provision that would prevent the Federal Government from ever shutting down again. But when this was attempted, the President, the Vice President, and many Members in this Chamber got out there saying, oh, you are hurting the flood victims, you are hurting the flood victims. I have to tell my colleagues as an American sitting out there on the couch watching TV, one would look at it and say, gee, how could anybody want to hurt the flood victims like that.

Then, as is the case usually in Washington, DC, you peel away a layer of rhetoric, you peel away another layer of demagoguery and one gets down to the facts, and the facts look quite different from what politicians inside Washington, DC, are telling us.

This is what the Philadelphia Inquirer wrote on Thursday, June 12. They quoted a political scientist from Carleton College in Minnesota, one of the affected areas, and his name is Steven Scheer and he is a political scientist. He said the following: "Federal money is already flowing into the flood-damaged areas, so this is not going to affect things for a while," said this Minnesota political scientist. Yet, the Democrats indicate that people are drowning and starving as a result of this. It is not true.

Let me say that again. It is not true. A political scientist who lives in Minnesota who studies politics and, more important, understands the pain and the suffering and the misery that the men and the women of the Midwest have been putting up with for so long says firsthand, "the Federal money is already here."

If anybody said what happened in Washington over the past week or two did anything to directly hurt people in the Midwest, then according to this political scientist quoted by the Philadelphia Inquirer, it is not true. Federal money is already flowing, so this is not going to affect things for a while. Yet

the Democrats indicate that people are drowning and starving as a result of this. It is not true.

So one sits there and one asks oneself, if it is not true, according to this political scientist in Minnesota and others who understand the process, why would the Vice President of the United States come out and say that it was true that somehow what happened in Washington last week was going to hurt people in the Midwest, or why would the President make the same inferences, why would people on this floor storm up to the microphone day after day after day after day and say something that clearly did not reflect reality?

Well, I guess unfortunately for too many in this Chamber it is politics as usual. If one cannot win by using the facts, then try to win by kind of shifting the facts around. Try to scare people. If one does not want people to sit down and know the real story, then kind of shuffle the deck a little bit and deal from the bottom of the deck once in a while and maybe one can confuse people enough. I mean maybe that is what they think. It is very unfortunate. But the reality is that flood money was sent to the Midwest and in fact has been fully funded for some time and will be fully funded for some time. But again, Democrats used this as a political attack last week for purely political purposes, and it is unfortunate.

So when the Vice President says "We want to make it clear that we will hurt you unless these provisions are accepted," it does not match up with reality. I can say as a Member from the State of Florida, which seems, unfortunately, seems to have a hurricane about two or three times a year, in my district especially—2 years ago we had two hurricanes in 1 month's time period—I understand firsthand about devastation. I understand about how in one day's time, a family's existence, a family's home, their property, their life, can be blown away with the wind, blown away by a flood.

So the last thing that I am going to want to do, the last thing that anybody here is going to want to do is to do anything to hurt flood victims. Again, we did not do that, but we have people coming up here and demagoguing on the issue to try to scare them. I think it is really unfortunate.

Again, that is what happened last year when we were talking about Medicare, when we were trying to save Medicare for senior citizens and keep it solvent. We had so many people coming down here and saying, oh, they are trying to cut Medicare, trying to do this, trying to do that, again, all for political points.

I can tell my colleagues, as somebody who is relatively new to this Chamber, it gets awfully frustrating that we find that too many times debate in this great Chamber, which is really the center of freedom around the world, is resolved to name-calling and

demagoguing and fingerpointing, when it would be so much better for the American people if we just debated on the facts.

Now, if we wanted to debate on the facts and if we wanted to find a situation that would hurt flood victims, I can give my colleagues one. I can tell my colleagues what will cause flood victims possibly the gravest risk in trying to put their lives back together as they seek assistance from Washington, DC. What will hurt flood victims in the Midwest the most, what will hurt victims of hurricanes in my part of the world, what will hurt earthquake victims on the west coast the most would be if this Federal Government ever shut down again and funding from Federal agencies were totally cut off. Because as I said before, those flood victims in the Midwest right now are fully funded for the next month or so, even without this emergency supplemental that we passed this last week. But if for some reason the White House and Congress got into a debate, got into a budget battle like we did a few years ago and the President, once again, vetoed every bill that Congress sent down over and over and over again, then the President's veto would have the effect of shutting down the Federal Government.

□ 1215

What do we do? I think we learned our lesson from last time. We wanted to purchase for the American people an insurance policy to make sure that the Federal Government never shuts down again, and to make sure that the flood victims in the Midwest and the victims of hurricanes in my region and earthquake victims in California do not get cut off from the Federal assistance that they say they need. So we put in a provision that is an insurance policy against the Federal Government ever shutting down.

Mr. Speaker, again, in Washington, DC, things are not ever as they seem. I have to tell the Members, for the President of the United States to say time and time again, for the Vice President, for many Members in this Chamber to say, let us never shut down the Federal Government again, I would think that anybody giving them an insurance policy that would stop the Federal Government from ever shutting down again would be a pretty good thing.

If we wanted to go a step further to make sure that the funding was at 100 percent, that they get every single cent that they would have gotten if we kept funding it at last year's level, we would make sure that this insurance policy paid these people at 100 percent. That is what we tried to do. I say, we tried to do. Actually, I did not vote for the CR bill that got down there, but we will get to the reason why in a second.

But the Republican majority put a bill together that would have in it an insurance policy to keep the Federal Government open and going at 100 percent funding so the flood victims would

not be hurt. Yet, the President vetoed that. The Vice President came out, and boy, he was mad. He said, how could they dare hurt the American people, and all we were trying to do was actually trying to help by keeping the Federal Government funded at 100 percent, to make sure that the Federal Government would never shut down.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the Members over the past 2 or 3 years how many times I have seen people come to that podium and say, Mr. Speaker, we must never shut down the Federal Government again. We would almost think if they had sackcloths they would tear them off and they would throw ashes all over their faces. These people were worked up. A couple of times I thought they were going to dab their eyes with the ties that they had, with all their little children on there, to show how much they love children.

Of course, those of us that happen to have children and love children but do not wear those ties, I guess, do not love children as much. But they would come down here and cry and whine, saying, how could we ever shut down the Federal Government again? You are going to hurt too many Americans. The children will be hurt. The grandparents will be hurt. Locusts will descend from the heavens. It will be the end of Western civilization as we know it or, as R.E.M. says, it is the end of the world as we know it.

So we put in this bill a continuing resolution to make sure that the Federal Government is fully funded. Guess what the President does? He vetoes it. So we are sitting there trying to figure out, why would the President veto a bill that we sent to him when he has been saying for 3 years that is what he wanted?

Me not being a really bright guy, I get most of my news from newspapers. So I get this editorial. I read this editorial from the Wall Street Journal. All of a sudden, it starts to make a little bit of sense to me. Now I understand why the President vetoed this insurance policy against shutting down the Federal Government.

The Wall Street Journal had it in their editorial on Tuesday last week, June 10. This is what the editorial says. They start out with a quote from President Clinton. He says this:

"Shutting down the Government again would be unbelievably irresponsible." So said President Clinton on January 20, 1996, when he was pinning blame for shutting down parts of the Federal Government on the Republican Congress. Yesterday he vetoed a GOP 'disaster relief' spending bill that contained a provision to prevent precisely that sort of shutdown.

"What gives?," asks the Wall Street Journal. "Won't a shutdown 'cause disruption in the lives of millions of Americans," as he said on November 14, 1995? What we have here is a moment of political revelation about the Clinton method: He wants to be able to threaten a shutdown, because he knows it'll

help him preserve the still-outsized government we have. And as always, he wants an issue, in this case 'disaster relief,' with which to demagogue his opponents."

This is the part I was talking about, about the flood relief bill getting shut down, vetoed this fall:

If any of those 13 spending bills that Congress passes are not signed by the start of the new fiscal year in October, the agencies they fund can't legally open. Democratic Congresses missed this deadline all the time, instead passing continuing resolutions until the final bills were signed around Christmas. This is what the GOP Congress wants to do for fiscal year 1998, proposing to fund the Government at 100 percent of the 1997 levels until they can work out a compromise with the President.

Again, this is that insurance policy that I was talking about. Democratic Congresses, when they ran the Government for 40 years, did these sorts of things all the time. You sign what is called a continuing resolution that funds the Government at 100 percent, to make sure it keeps going. But this is what the President used to try to veto the bill.

"This would keep the Government running, denying Mr. Clinton the chance to dump blame on the GOP. The President's political leverage would thus be reduced and he'd have to fight over each spending bill on the merits. Not that he is helpless: Unlike GOP Presidents, Mr. Clinton can now wield a line item veto, if he has the nerve. But this is trench warfare, where Congress can fight on more equal terms than the evening news.

"Mr. Clinton can't afford to admit to any of this political calculation, of course. That's why he's trying to change the subject entirely and make this a debate about 'disaster relief,' which no one opposes. If Mr. Clinton really wants disaster relief, he can sign the bill."

Again, what you do, I guess, in Washington, when they have got you, when the President says for 3 years, give me a continuing resolution, give me an insurance policy to make sure the Federal Government never shuts down, and we give it to him, he changes the subject. He says, how can you hurt these poor flood victims?

Of course, we were not hurting the poor flood victims. As the Philadelphia Inquirer again quoted the political scientist from Minnesota, Federal money is already flowing into the region, yet the Democrats are indicating people are drowning and starving as a result of this, but it is not true. The flood victims have been taken care of. They will continue to be taken care of.

So unfortunately, all of these statements that have been made, according to this political scientist, just are not true. It is a political battle, it is a political battle that a lot of Americans

have not been following, but it is a political battle that is important, because as we go throughout the fall trying to balance the budget for the first time in a generation, trying to give tax relief back to working class Americans, and trying to save the next generation from the crushing debt that this generation is passing on to them, we have got to be able to negotiate with the President in good faith and make sure, and make sure, that he will do the type of things that Americans sent us to Washington to do: to balance the budget, to cut taxes, to send money, power, and influence back to the American people, and yes, to save the American dream for the 21st century.

My son is visiting me this week up in Washington, DC. In fact, he is in the gallery right now. When I see him and his friends running around and playing, like any parent, you start saying, what is their life going to be like 10, 15, 20 years from now? What type of country are they going to live in?

I want to make sure they live in an America where they can pursue the American dream, just like my parents made sure I was able to pursue the American dream, instead of having a country where they are paying 89 percent in taxes to the Federal Government because of the huge Federal debt that Congress and Presidents have thrown on the American people over the past 40 years.

We have to do something to make a difference, so that is why this insurance policy against shutting down the Federal Government was so important, and why it was so regrettable, first of all, that the President vetoed the bill, because he knew what was doing; and secondly, it was doubly regrettable that he would actually, and I want to be careful here, it is regrettable that he would use flood victims in an attempt to change the subject.

Because the President knows, just like the political science professor in Minnesota knows, just like the Philadelphia Inquirer knows, just like the Wall Street Journal knows, just like everybody that has studied this issue knows, flood relief was pouring into the Midwest. This political battle in Washington, DC was not affecting them. In the end, the only real damage that was done was done on a public relations front to the Republican party.

I am sure that we will all be big enough to dust ourselves off and get past that. That is really not my concern. It is not any member of the Republican party's concern, or at least it should not be. Our concern is making sure those people in the Midwest are taken care of, and they are. We wanted to make sure that the Federal Government was not going to be shut down this fall, and that Federal funding would truly not be cut off.

Reviewing, Mr. Speaker, the President and Vice President say that this budget debate hurt people in the Midwest. It did not. It did not. The funding

was already up there. As the Philadelphia Inquirer says, it was used for political purposes.

Secondly, the President and the Democrats have been coming up here for years and have said that they want to make sure that the Federal Government never shuts down again. I guess they really do not care, in the end, do they? They had an opportunity. We gave them an insurance policy to make sure the Federal Government never shut down again, and they were all against it. So they can never say that again, right?

I do not know. In Washington, DC, I think anything is possible. Maybe they will have the audacity to come up here in the next couple of weeks, months, years, and talk about how they want to make sure the Federal Government never shuts down again, but they had an opportunity last week to take care of that, and they decided that they would rather play political games than pass an insurance policy to make sure the Federal Government never shuts down again.

The third thing I want to talk about and conclude on, Mr. Speaker, the third point is, there is a lot of disingenuousness that was going on in the Chamber last week when I heard so many Democrats come up and say, we want a clean bill. Mr. Speaker, send us a clean bill. This is about disaster relief. This is about flood victims. Send us a clean bill, they said.

Did they want a clean bill? No, not really. Not really. Do Members want to know what a clean bill would have been? It would have been about a \$750 million bill to take care of flood relief in the Midwest. Do Members know how much that \$750 million bill ended up being? It was \$8.4 billion. There was enough pork in that bill to feed everybody in Washington, DC for the next 6 months.

There is a parking garage in Cleveland, OH, that somehow found its way into this emergency flood relief bill. In fact, when we tried to take it out Democrats on that side of the aisle said it was a deal killer. They needed that garage. Was it an emergency? No, it was not an emergency. Did it have anything to do with the flood? No, it did not have anything to do with the flood. Was keeping it in making it a clean flood bill? No, it certainly was not. That is pork, plain and simple. It had nothing to do with disaster relief.

There are so many other issues. There was another provision that I read about in the New York Times where the New York Times wrote about how there was a movie theater that needed some repairs, needed some renovations, so it got shoved into this emergency flood bill.

The New York Times went and talked to the manager of the theater, and said, is your theater in really dire need of repair? He said, well, no, not really. A couple of pipes have leaked, but other than that it is doing OK. It had nothing to do with the flood, was

not even in the region, and yet another politician in Washington, DC saw that as a reason to shove some more pork into supposedly this emergency relief bill that the Democrats said they wanted to be clean.

□ 1230

And of course, there is also funding for apple orchardists; and I have had trouble tying that one to the flood. I guess the closest I could get was that maybe there were some apple orchard farmers in Washington State that might have seen the flood on TV, and maybe it traumatized them so much they could not go out and work in their orchards. I do not know. I could not figure it out.

But once again, this funding had nothing to do with the flood relief. And yet it got shoved into that bill, and yet we had Democrats that actually had the audacity to come on this floor last week complaining about how they wanted a clean bill. Well, let me tell my colleagues, unfortunately, as I am finding in Washington, DC, there are not a whole heck of a lot of bills that end up being clean. There are not a whole heck of a lot of businesses where pork is not being shoved in left and right.

For some reason, that is the way this place works. I do not like it, but it seems like that is the reality. But it is a reality that the Democrats mastered for 40 years while they were in the majority, while the deficit and the debt went up to \$5 trillion. They are the ones that were shoving in parking garages into this flood bill and then coming back and talking in self-righteous indignation about how they wanted a clean flood bill and because the flood bill was not clean, they were going to veto it.

And you know, by the end of it, I have got to admit, I was a little bit disillusioned. Like I said, I came here in 1994 and have been here for about 2 or 3 years. I just never knew it worked like this, that we could have people come on this floor and purposely make statements that they knew were false saying that somebody was trying to hurt flood victims by cutting off relief; and they knew that was false but they said it anyway to gain political points. I did not know that we could have the President of the United States and the Vice President and Democrats and some Republicans come on the floor and bang a podium as hard as they did saying, we must never shut down the Federal Government again; and then when we give them an insurance policy to make sure that the Federal Government never shuts down again, they veto it. I just never knew that people did that, that they could get away with that.

I guess the third thing I did not know was that we can have the same people who were saying do not put pork into this bill, give us a cheap emergency relief bill; those same people, while they were saying that, were the very ones

that were shoving pork into the bill. Of course, both sides do that, we find out now. But only one side is the one that is preaching about how they are holier than thou and about how they are self-righteous. And it is just upsetting, it is disappointing. Because I think what it comes down to is there are a lot of people in this Chamber and down in the White House who think that the American people are stupid. That does not sound nice. It really does not sound nice. But I think they really believe the pollsters, and I think they believe the pundits that they can somehow fool all the people all the time. It just is not the case.

I remember last year when we went through the Medicare crisis that we went through, the President of the United States had the Medicare trustees put a report together, and these Medicare trustees came back saying that, unless Medicare was reformed quickly, we would go bankrupt in 3 or 4 years. Well, that is serious.

I think of my grandparents. I think of my mother and father, my mother in a week, I should not say in the House, but my mother in a week will turn 65 years old. This deeply affects all of us. And I think I am going to have to apologize to my mother for that for revealing her age. But it deeply affects all Americans. It deeply affects middle-class Americans who are struggling to put up with the bills and the debts and the crises that they have to deal with day in and day out without having to worry about Medicare going bankrupt and having to take care of their parents, which they want to do but economically cannot do it.

So when the President's Medicare task force comes out and says Medicare is going bankrupt, something has to be done, then doggone it, something has to be done. And so, we walked right into that. We, as the Republican Party, tried to do something about saving Medicare. And we know, most of the newspapers, most of the magazines said that what we did was laudable, that what we did was correct, that we could extend the life of Medicare for another 10 years.

And so, we passed the bill and then the President vetoed the bill, shut down the Government by vetoing every appropriation bill we sent his way and said that we were slashing Medicare, that we were cutting Medicare, that we were hurting Medicare, that we were hurting senior citizens. Well, I guess, is it the chickens that come home to roost? I guess the chickens came home to roost last week, because a nearly identical bill came before Congress this year, and the same President and the same Democrats that last year were talking about how we were slashing Medicare voted almost unanimously to pass the bill. And they did so because they had to because now, instead of Medicare going bankrupt in 3 or 4 years, we find out that Medicare is going bankrupt in 2 or 3 years because, as usual, we choose politics over good

practice and we choose demagoguery over common sense when it is time to gain political points in Washington, DC.

It is sad. It is regrettable. It is unfortunate. But it is the way that this White House does business, and it is the way they have done business. And I think things not only need to change, I think things will change, because I do not believe that Americans are stupid. I do not believe that Americans think the worst of other people. I think Americans are a generous people. I think we are a proud people. And I think we are gifted. I think we can recognize what is right and what is wrong.

If we have to save future generations from a staggering \$5 trillion debt, we are going to do that. If we have to cut taxes for working-class Americans because they are spending half of their year paying off the Federal Government, I think we will do that. If we have to save Medicare, if we have to save Social Security, I think in the end we will do that.

We have done great things, great things over the past 20 years. Throughout the 1980's, we had the longest expansion of the economy ever in this history during peacetime, and we won the cold war. In the 1990's, we have had a strong, strong economic expansion. Our economy is growing and we are doing some great things, but we have to continue and we have to fight. I think we have to look for the best in people. I think we have to give American people credit, that we just cannot trot out and say, oh, my opponents hate children, my opponents hate senior citizens, my opponents hate flood victims; because I think we are underestimating the brilliance of the American people.

I think what has happened in the past couple weeks is regrettable, and I hope other Members will come to the floor and will set the record straight and will not run away from criticism like scalded dogs but instead will come to the floor and say three very simple things. The first thing is say, the liberals say we are trying to hurt flood victims. We are not trying to hurt flood victims. The money is still going up there, and we have proof and show the proof.

The second thing they need to come out and say is, the Democrats and the liberals attack the conservatives, saying that they were not going to give the President a clean flood bill. What we need to say is, look at all the garbage that is shoved in that bill. If it is not a clean bill, the parking garage that was put in there and subsidies for apple orchardists that was put in and all the other things that were put in there did not make it any cleaner. We need to work together to make sure this type of bill never passes again.

And the third thing we need to say is, OK, Mr. President, you have been saying for 3 years you do not want to shut down the Federal Government. OK, Mr. Vice President, you have been saying

for 3 years you do not want to ever shut down the Federal Government. OK, Mr. Minority Leader, minority whip, you have been saying for 3 years you never want to shut down the Federal Government again. OK, fine, let us give the American people the insurance policy to make sure that the Federal Government never shuts down again, that flood relief is never cut off, that housing assistance to the poor is never cut off again, that all these other things that the Federal Government has been doing never gets cut off again by passing the insurance policy to keep the Federal Government running that this Congress passed a few weeks ago and that the President vetoed.

I do not think we can afford those types of vetoes. We cannot afford the zigzagging. We cannot afford the mixed messages that we have been having for too long. And in conclusion, we cannot afford to have a silent majority in this House who will not stand up and speak out and tell the American people the truth.

The American people are grown up. They are intelligent. They are brilliant. They have created the greatest governmental experiment, the greatest country in the history of civilization. They can take the truth. It is time for this silent majority to once again reassert itself, become a vocal majority, go out and tell the American people the truth, and prepare this country for the 21st century so my children and their children and the American people's future generations can prepare for the 21st century and chase the American dream into the next century like I was able to do.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes each day on June 17 and 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BENTSEN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HOUGHTON.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that