illegal GOPAC campaign contributions, about the $250,000 of NEWT's support, as they call it, for Speaker GINGRICH.

As the nonpartisan citizens action group, Common Cause, said yesterday, in calling for the recusal and removal of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct chairman, ''What is at stake is the integrity of the House ethics process.'' It is time to end the coverup and stand up for law enforcement.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, Republicans in Congress have advocated a fair, realistic agenda, literally the beginning of this session of Congress. We want to balance the budget in 7 years using honest Congressional Budget Office numbers. We want to save Medicare from going bankrupt. We want genuine welfare that emphasizes work and we want to cut taxes for working families.

Despite the unending stream of misinformation coming from the press these days, the American people overwhelmingly endorse this agenda. A recent mega poll taken of 7,200 registered voters confirm that there is wide and popular support for the Balanced Budget Act now sitting on the President's desk. In fact, 86 percent of the poll's respondents said that the budget issue should be squared away this year, now.

The President should stop the rhetoric and sign what the American people overwhelmingly support, the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

DELAYED DECISION FROM COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

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

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, for 14 months the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct has dithered, dallied, and delayed making a decision on the complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH. As we learned earlier this year, delays in the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct investigations give the appearance of a coverup. The secrecy and delays connected with the Bob Packwood investigation brought disgrace to this institution. Let us not repeat the same mistake when it comes to the Speaker of the House.

Public pressure and the increasing public disclosure of potential wrongdoing has compelled Republicans on the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct to consider an outside counsel, but only with severely limited duties, so that many of the questions that need to be answered would be left untouched.

Mr. Speaker, we need an outside counsel allowed to conduct a full investigation, and let the chips fall where they may. As Mr. GINGRICH himself said in 1988, the only way to ensure a thorough nonpartisan investigation of the highest ranking Member of the House is to appoint an outside counsel with, and I quote, ''The independence necessary to do a thorough and complete job.''

The time to appoint an outside counsel is now. Further delays will cause damage to this institution.

PRESIDENT CLINTON AND THE CBO

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I notice none of our Democratic colleagues want to talk about the budget this morning. Perhaps that is because they are just as confused as we are about the President's latest proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the President now says that pursuant to the bill that he signed into law, he will propose a balanced budget in 7 years, but he wants to use false numbers generated by the Office of Management and Budget.

The last time the President put forward a so-called budget, it was a vague 22-page summary, and the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office said it had annual deficits in the range of $200 billion as far as the eye could see, well into the next century. Now the President says he will give us the details, but he still does not want to use Congressional Budget Office numbers, as he is obligated to do by the bill he signed into law.

Yet, the President, a few years ago, stood right here, gave a State of the Union Address, February 17, 1993, and said, quote, ''I will point out that the Congressional Budget Office, which is normally more conservative about what is going to happen, and closer to right than previous Presidents have been. I did this so that we could argue about priorities with the same set of numbers.''

It is time for the President to get with the program and follow the law that he signed.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the invitation from my colleague to talk about the budget, because that is exactly what I came here to talk about.

Last Friday I was down in Durham, NC, in my congressional district, talking to poor people about the reconciliation bill and the budget that has been proposed by my Republican colleagues. They could not believe what I was telling them: $270 billion in cuts in Medicare, $180 billion in cuts in Medicaid, making our health and our future at risk.

They could not believe that our Republican colleagues were talking about cutting reading programs for the most vulnerable kids in America. They could not believe that they were talking about taking kids, 1 to 2 million more kids, and putting them in poverty, all for the purpose of giving a tax break to the richest people in America. Get real. This is real dollars we are talking about, and the future of our country we are talking about.

CLINTON BUDGET COSTS AMERICAN CHILDREN

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I give credit to the liberal education system that our colleagues cannot add or subtract. There is no cut in Medicare, and they know that. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton budget costs American children $187,000, just on the interest of the national debt. By contrast, the Republican Congress is turning toward the best interest of our American children, balancing the budget and investing in their education.

I have heard colleagues say we are cutting programs such as Goals 2000. Absolutely. We zeroed out, and I would do it again, Goals 2000 on a Federal level. We are spending the money down at the State level, sending the money closest to the people, driving it down to the school districts. And they can do a Goals 2000 at the State level, but they do not have 38 instances in the bill of Goals 2000 that said the State will do this or the Federal intrusion. They can still do a Goals 2000 and these other programs. Any additional savings goes to the children.

ORGAN DONATION

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

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is very near and dear to my heart. Organ donation. As most of my colleagues know, I underwent a successful liver transplant this summer, and because someone gave me the gift of life, I am able to be with all my friends today.

Lucky for me, organ transplantation is no longer an experimental procedure, but rather a lifesaving procedure. My colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, FLOYD SPENCE, and I are certainly living proof that transplantation works and that it saves lives.

But, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, FLOYD SPENCE and I were the lucky ones. The fact of the matter is, most Americans have no idea of the importance of organ and tissue donation.