called We the Living, which was produced by the School of the Arts and the South Area High School. It is a play reflecting the problems faced by our youth today regarding drugs and violence.

The young people put on this performance to display the concerns that are expressed in the school environment: the peer pressure, the degradation of life, and all the tragedies that result in the abuse of narcotics. It is important today, as we have many closeup students in the gallery, to understand how destructive drugs are and how destructive violence is in our school system.

''We the Living,'' the play, exemplified why students are fighting, fighting for survival in the classroom, fighting for survival in the streets of our communities, all recognizing that the one fundamental problem that is so difficult for them to overcome is the influence of drugs in our society and the influence peer pressure has in the first attempt to use drugs.

Again, I applaud the Caring Foundation, and I urge all of our schools and all of our youth to do what they can to not make it cool to be involved in narcotics or illegal activities, but in fact, that it would be cool to say no. As in the DARE Program and the Just Say No Program, stand up and be counted against the destruction of human life, the destruction and aggravation of human suffering which drugs provide.

I would also like to speak about child abuse today, because that is another topic that is creating tremendous havoc in our Nation. Our children are abused daily. We are reading about more shocking details of abuse and abandonment, both sexually and otherwise, and it just has to stop. As a nation, we have to lead the charge against child abuse, most strictly penalize those that would bring about child abuse, especially sexual abuse, and fight for the rights of our children, because once they are abused, it is a very difficult and tragic way to come back into society. Palm Beach County is starting a Home Safe project, which will give children a chance to be in an environment safe from the dangerous opportunities they experienced in their homes.

I would also like to take a moment and look at the headlines ''Hamas Bomb Kills 13 at Mall in Tel Aviv; Bomb Ravages Israel.'' The war in Israel is a tragedy. The New York Times did a wonderful editorial today, basically outlining the problems: The suicide bombings, the difficulties that are being experienced by the people of Israel. We in America, and I know my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, JON FOX, joins in a strong condemnation of these attacks, a strong condemnation against violence, not only in Israel, but in London and in other places around the globe.

□ 1315

But the one thing they stress in the editorial, the war in Israel, the war between a small group of fanatics who want to destroy the chances for peace and the millions of Israelis and Palestinians who want to live side-by-side in peace, prosperity, and security, the fanatics must not be allowed to prevail.

Both sides, the Israelis and the Palestinians, want peace. There are a few radical groups that are trying to dislodge that peace. We must remain calm and committed to peace in Israel. We must remain calm and keep the PLO and others at the table to ensure the survival of the Middle East. We cannot condone or tolerate terrorism, and we certainly cannot condone it in Israel or, as I mentioned, in London. It simply must stop.

The hatred, the violence, the antisemitics in this country must stop. The campaigns that are being waged for the Presidency, the dialog needs to change and we need to focus on the future of America, not dividing people by color, race or ethnicity, not dividing people by differences of opinion, but thinking of what unites this country together in a spirit of independence and democracy.

This is the greatest Nation in the world. We have so much to be proud of, and at the same time we seem to be destroying everything we have worked for for 200-plus years by divisive, nasty, mean-spirited debate. It needs to stop, and it needs to stop by arguments by both sides of the aisle that for democracy to prevail, men need to think with their heads clearly, committed to compassion and to people's rights.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The gentleman is reminded that Members are not to make reference to visitors in the gallery of the House.

THE 104TH CONGRESS PROMISES BRIGHT ECONOMIC FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I join with Congressman FOLEY in his astute remarks regarding our need for prayer for the families of those who were killed and those who were injured senselessly in Israel in recent days and weeks at the hands of the Hamas. We certainly cannot tolerate this kind of violence in this country or any other country, including Israel, one of our greatest allies in this world.

I do hope, as Congressman FOLEY pointed out, our work will continue with this country and with Israel to make sure the peace process moves forward, and the senseless acts of a few fanatics will not deter us from our mission to restore peace to the Middle East. And whatever we can do as a country, working together with the White House and our President, there is a resolve within this House and within this Congress that we do everything and anything we can to make sure that peace is brought to that region of the world and that we support Prime Minister Peres in his efforts to continue the peace process.

I have today the opportunity also to introduce legislation which goes to much of what the 104th Congress on a bipartisan fashion has been working on, and that is to create jobs, have a pro-growth Congress which will sustain not only the economic future of America but make sure there are better chances for more jobs. That is why I have introduced today legislation dealing with creating and providing tax credits for investment and research and experimentation. These are pro-business, pro-people measures which I think will help create the jobs and the investment that is important.

Specifically H.R. 2984 will extend the research tax credit through December 1997, expand the definition of start-up firms, allow taxpayers to elect an alternative incremental credit process, and treat 80 percent of research as qualified instead of the 65 percent limit we now have. In addition, the 10 percent investment tax credit will be reinstated and have the effect of reducing the tax burden on new investment, speeding up the growth of the economy, improving competitiveness of the U.S. business firms, and laying the foundation for a future rise in the United States' standard of living.

I would ask that the Congressman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], and the Congressman from California [Mr. RIGGS], join me in this special order with regard to the kinds of things that we have been trying to do in this Congress, in this historic 104th House, to get our fiscal house in order.

I am speaking of balancing the budget, having a line-item veto passed, my legislation to sunset review Federal agencies that have outlived their usefulness or should be privatized, downsized or consolidated, the kinds of things we have done to help businesses by having deductibility for health insurance, regulatory review so it is easier for businesses to operate. And also our legislation has already brought $190 billion in spending reductions and $190 billion in deficit reduction.

So I would ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], to tell us with regard to the interaction you have had with your constituents in Florida, have they discussed with you the benefits they see of having a balanced budget, one that would be bipartisan and one that would embrace collectively what the White House and the Congress wants with regard to our children's future and the country's future and a balanced budget.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] yielding. One of the things

that I hear from my constituents when I return home is the fact that the balanced budget is first and foremost in their minds. They are not necessarily interested in what party gets credit, but they want this Government to learn to live by the same standards our society imposes on the average citizen. Balancing your checkbook, that is normal. I mean if you do not, as you know, Mr. FOX, if somebody issues a worthless check, it is rejected by the bank.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Right.

Mr. FOLEY. If you overcharge on your credit card, they will cancel your card. If you do not pay your home mortgage, they will foreclose your home. But the Federal Government somehow spends $200 plus billion a year that they do not have and they call that compassionate and good Government.

Well, they are telling me, ''MARK, seek out a solution. The rhetoric needs to stop. We don't want to hear anymore about during the Reagan years and the Bush years, those Presidents ran up the budget because you know the that Congress is the one with the checkbook, not the Presidents.''

So it is our incumbent responsibility as legislators to focus on where the spending is occurring and how we alleviate the spending, and I think we have done a yeoman's job of attempting to portray that. You know, the other outside influences try to paint us as noncaring, wanting to destroy the fiber and safety net of this Nation. But to the contrary, when you read some great editorials, I think Mr. RIGGS referred to one earlier, Mr. Glassman has been great in portraying the fact that Republicans are not cutting near what is being accused, 7 percent growth rate in Medicare, 7.5. All of the programs grow in excess of CPI.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, to expand on that, people might be listening and saying, some of my colleagues, what is the advantage of a balanced budget?

Well, the advantage, according to Alan Greenspan with the Federal Reserve, is by having reduced interest costs it will be easier to afford a mortgage, easier to pay for a college loan, easier to pay for a car expense. Those kinds of things are in real dollars going to be decreased in cost if we can in fact pass a balanced budget, and also create about 300,000 new jobs a year. So the overall boost to our economy will be terrific.

Mr. FOLEY. People do not realize the nexus. The Government is out bidding for dollars like a private consumer. So while the Government drives up interest costs with its ever-excessive appetite for credit, it is driving up comparable mortgage costs.

A plain example by Mr. Greenspan is the fact that with current rates at about 7¼ to 7⅝ on a 30-year fixed home mortgage, we could see those rates decline to 6 percent, maybe below. A 2-percent difference in a $100,000 mortgage is $200 in savings in the consumer's pockets from interest savings alone, $2,000 per annum, which is about $180 per month in the homeowners' pockets to spend on their families, vacations, children's savings account, and what have you. So clearly, clearly the balanced budget will provide an economic windfall, not only for the taxpayers of having to pay fewer dollars into the public treasury, but more yield back home in their individual accounts.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think it is also important to note that frankly this can be done easily if we put our heads and minds and hearts into working together. We have seen since the beginning of this balanced budget debate that the majority side of the aisle has added $440 billion more funding for Medicare, for Medicaid, for the environment, for education, and for the earned income tax credit.

So those kinds of cooperative ventures by the Republican side certainly have gone without notice in some quarters, but are certainly not lost on those of us who are still speaking today in the well of the House, because we believe that there can be, in fact in the not too distant future, an actual agreement on the balanced budget. The President has actually said, under different year points he has talked about, we can have a balanced budget in any number of years. I think if we can just get to the table and talk about removing gridlock, getting away from finger pointing and not worrying about who gets the credit, it is amazing how much we can get done.

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FOLEY. That is the sad part of the political debate, people need credit for everything. We were sent here from around the country, 435 individuals, 100 Members in the Senate, and the President, Vice President, elected by the people of America to lead, not to take unnecessary advantage but to solve the people's problems.

So again, I think we have got to put beyond our debate who eventually gets credit for the legislation. It is more important that the American public sense a victory here, that the consumer senses a victory.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I agree.

Mr. FOLEY. That the public at large senses that Congress is acting responsibly, that they are no longer going to send or return Members of Congress to this great body just simply because they said, ''Look at all that I have done for you, and look at all the bacon and pork that I have brought home to our district. Isn't that reason enough to reelect me?''

It is about saying, ''What have you done to reduce the burden on the American consumer, reduce the burden on business? What have you done to make it easier for us to educate our children?'' I think these are the questions in the debate that is going to rage in November, not about whose party is right or whose party is wrong. It is about what did you personally do as an individual that we sent here to represent our great district, to make a difference in America.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] would join us in this discussion regarding the balanced budget and its benefit to the country. From California, as a favorite son, he might want to give us a little bit of his insights into what his district believes and what he thinks is appropriate as we move forward in this debate.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate the gentleman yielding, and taking the leadership initiative in organizing this special order.

What I would really like to do is compare the Clinton crunch with the balanced budget bonus; that is to say, the benefits to the average American family that will result from putting our fiscal house in order back here, eliminating deficit spending and balancing the Federal budget, versus the present economic predicament that we as a nation find ourselves in.

As both gentlemen will very well remember, the President back on January 23 visited our Chamber and stood at this podium right behind me to deliver his annual State of the Union Message, and in that speech just less than 2 months ago he told us that our economy is the healthiest it has been in three decades and he proclaimed the era of big government over.

We have all learned to expect, particularly from this President, some fairly outrageous statements. In fact, I think it was Jay Leno that pointed that out the other night. I guess we can sort of plagiarize from Jay Leno, because once he says it on The Tonight Show, it is out there in the public realm.

Jay Leno said the other night, ''Republicans have the choice of eight presidential candidates.'' But then he went on to say, ''But you know, the Democrats have much more than eight when you think about it. They have got the old Clinton, the new Clinton, the big-government-is-over Clinton, the highest-tax-increase-in-history Clinton, and so on.''

Well, I think when we scrutinize the President's comments, we realize that, No. 1, the economy is not by any stretch of the imagination the healthiest it has been in three decades. And second, we realize that if the President really ended or would join us in ending the era of big government, and if he really helped us in turning over Washington power to individuals and communities, the American people would not now be experiencing the Clinton crunch: higher taxes and stagnant wages.

The reality behind the President's rhetoric is that in each and every year of his presidency, the typical American family has had less income than when

President Clinton took office. Last year alone, the typical family earned $790 less than in 1992, according to the Census Bureau. But while family incomes have fallen, the family tax burden has risen in America and, that is a result obviously of policies adopted by this body prior to the Republican Party becoming the majority in Congress, and policies that were signed into law by the President during the first 2 years of his administration.

So we have had this Clinton crunch, this double whammy of stagnant wages and rising taxation, including payroll taxes rising on the backs of American workers. We all remember that back in 1993 the President and the liberal House Democrats or liberal congressional Democrats enacted the largest tax increase in history, and the result is that the typical family now spends 24.5 percent of its income in Federal taxes, a greater share of its income than at any other time in America's peacetime history. And we will remember, of course, that that Clinton democratic tax increase passed the Congress without a single Republican vote.

□ 1330

When you add up Federal, State, and local taxes, families today are paying more than 38 percent of their income in taxes, according to the Tax Foundation, and in many families that ultimately means one spouse has to work, not to support the family but simply to support the government and the burden of taxation.

So I want to talk a little bit about here over the next few minutes again those two factors, falling incomes and rising taxes, and how that has created the Clinton crunch versus the bonus that every single American family would receive from balancing the Federal budget.

I appreciate, again, the gentleman organizing this special order.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentleman's remarks. I think that you have been one of the leaders, along with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY], in moving ahead in a fiscally responsible balanced budget debate and one that embraces, I think, what most Americans want, and that is more money in their pocket and less money in the Government's pocket, and that makes a big difference.

In addition to having a balanced budget and removing, you know, fraud, waste, and abuse from the Government, we are talking about tax reform, and that it is what the President campaigned on. He said he wanted to give us three things in 1992; he wanted to have a middle-class tax reform, balanced budget, and he wanted to end welfare as we know it. We have sent him three bills, and he has vetoed three of them. Hope springs eternal. I still believe in the long run he is going to sign bills we in a bipartisan fashion can agree on.

Mr. RIGGS. There is a certain irony in a new Republican congressional majority trying to help a Democratic President make good on his fundamental campaign promises. That is exactly the case.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It shows the cooperation we are giving.

Mr. RIGGS. That is right. Yet, as the gentleman points out, the President campaigned on promises of balancing the Federal budget, ending welfare as we know it, as you pointed out, cutting middle-class taxes. The middle-class tax cut was the centerpiece of his economic plan, which he called Putting People First. He certainly did not make good on any of those promises during the first 2 years of his administration, when he had a Democratic majority in the Congress to work with.

He has turned around, of course, in this session of Congress, vetoed legislation that would accomplish all three of those fundamental promises to the American people that we, the Republican majority here in the Congress, enacted with very little support from the other side of the aisle. There is a certain irony, again, in a Republican majority of Congress trying to help a Democratic President make good on his fundamental campaign promises.

Mr. FOLEY. I am anxious if somebody can tell me what is right with our welfare system today. For a President to veto what I believe is a bipartisan effort to reform a tragic situation that perhaps people in a welfare system, with no means of exit, how anybody can defend the current status quo and not be seriously concerned about not only the future of this Nation but those we pretend to care for is beyond me. I go home to the district. I would be interested if the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] have any other indications. When I go home to the district, my constituents resoundingly say, ''MARK, help people with the Association for Retarded Citizens, help those mentally or physically challenged who have not been given the full tools to do what they need to do to function in society. But, by God, get healthy, capable, able-bodied people out of the welfare rolls and out in the workplace.'' What is good about the proposed legislation, not adopted by the President, but certainly, hopefully, in the near future will be, under that legislation you spoke of, there are some or many good points with it, the able-bodied people to be in a job within 5 years, with the Federal Government assisting with job training, job counseling, job placement, day care, if necessary. That is certainly, in a sense, moving ahead, still leaving a safety net for those who are unable to work, or have to take care of a child, and increased enforcement by Governors to collect child support.

I always love the example about the State of Maine, where they threatened to take away the drivers licenses of those deadbeat dads who have not paid child support, but all but 50 out of 21,000 paid within a record period of time. This is legislation that is going to make sure child support is paid, to make sure food, nutrition programs, frankly, we feed more children, we also do so with quality standards that the Federal Government is going to enumerate, so I think that, you know, the welfare reform we discussed and proposed and passed in the House in a bipartisan fashion certainly will, hopefully, come to life again in this second session of the 104th Congress.

Perhaps the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] could shed some light on why he feels this bill, the revitalized bill, would be beneficial, what your take is from California.

Mr. RIGGS. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. He just described a version of welfare reform that received the unanimous bipartisan endorsement of 45 of the 50 Governors, or Nation's Governors, meeting back here in Washington in February.

You know, I think the President has revealed his true colors on the question of welfare reform. Not only has he twice vetoed the welfare reform legislation sent to him by the House and the Senate, but he is now saying, after initially encouraging this bipartisan group of Governors to help us craft a bipartisan compromise, he is now pulling the rug out from underneath them. He has indicated through his Cabinet Secretary, Secretary of Health and Human Services Shalala, last week the administration's disapproval of the unanimous Governors' agreement. I just want to again stress how rare unanimity is in American politics today. We had 45 of the 50 Nation's Governors meeting back here in February. Again, they unanimously supported and endorsed these welfare reforms which the President is indicating that he opposes and will veto.

So it is very clear to me that this President, who as a candidate promised to end welfare as we know, is not sincere in that promise. He would, furthermore, have a real political problem with the far left wing of his party if he were to meet us somewhere in the middle in trying to craft bipartisan welfare reform legislation.

So it is very disappointing again to see the President fail to make good on one of his fundamental campaign promises from 1992.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I wanted to reclaim the time because one of the other items I thought was very sensitive in the legislation dealing with welfare reform, that is, making sure teenage moms who need health care, formulas for their children, clothing, under the present program they would get cash assistance. Unfortunately, some of those teenage mothers frankly do not have the wherewithal to understand we cannot use those funds for drugs or alcohol and have been doing so. Under our legislation they would get vouchers instead, not for drugs or alcohol but vouchers for formula, health care, clothing for the child and the baby or child, and frankly this is a

much more humane way of making sure we take care of those truly in need and not waste the money for what it was not intended.

So, while some may cast that this Congress is being tough, we are not being fair in making sure the benefits that those who are in the safety net must be saved, and we are going to save them. We do not want people milking the system and taking the money, using it for purposes other than what was intended.

Mr. RIGGS. Very clearly we have to reform the welfare system that fails too many of our fellow citizens and too often subsidizes illegitimacy, really, with our current welfare system, and this political constituency of dependency that has been created back here in Washington over the last three to four decades created a welfare state, if you will, where too many families now find themselves also dependent on welfare over several generations, and again that has led to soaring rates of illegitimacy and family disintegration in America.

I think the American people know the welfare system is broke. They certainly have every right to expect of us that we will acknowledge the problem and attempt to fix it in a bipartisan manner. Again, that is exactly what we have done. That is the legislation the President vetoed. That is the legislation that is heartily recommended and endorsed by 45 of the Governors meeting back here in February.

Mr. FOLEY. It is not just the public that is upset. I met with a young girl, 22 years old, in Belle Glade, FL, in a course sponsored by the Private Industry Council to learn to be a nurse. She came up to me at a graduation reception, where she had gotten her degree for nursing all on her own. She said, ''Mr. Foley, I am 22. I have five children. I am not married. The welfare system has encouraged me to stay in the welfare system and have babies.'' This is not a made-up story. This is an absolute occurrence that happened in my district.

She said, ''For the first time, the Private Industry Council is giving me some hope for my future and for my children. But I am telling you it is a tragedy what we do as a Nation to encourage people to have additional babies out of wedlock, that they will get additional food stamps, AFDC and housing allowances if they simply add another child to the roster.'' She said, ''This has got to stop.'' She said, ''I am a sad example of what is wrong with the system. I am 22 years old, with five kids.'' I was amazed. She said, ''You have got to do everything you can to not hurt children, to make sure I or others like me are not encouraged to proliferate additional children to the society, knowing more money is coming your way.''

Mr. RIGGS. I think our fellow citizens know the American welfare system today too often discourages the very things that we want to promote as societal ideals. It is a system that is riddled with perverse incentives that discourage working, marriage, savings, investment, and that is why it is so important that we reform the welfare system.

If the gentleman would just yield further, because unfortunately I am going to have to leave and I want to kind of complete this idea of the Clinton crunch versus the balanced budget bonus.

I want to stress, because I think the gentleman from Florida alluded earlier, there is really nothing to be gained, going back and revisiting the 1980's. I think if we look at economic policy, fiscal policy in the 1980's, there is plenty of blame to go around. We have no intention here, as the new Republican majority in Congress, of repeating those same mistakes, and that again the perverse notion that we could cut taxes and increase spending, which gave us these enormous deficits that have ultimately left us with a staggering national debt which our kids and grandkids are going to inherit.

Instead, when we passed the balanced budget, the balanced budget, the first balanced budgets in 26 years, the balanced budget the President vetoed, we had tax cuts for working families. We believe that it is possible to cut Federal spending and cut taxes, and that the combination of the two will give the American people a tremendous economic dividend, what we call the balanced budget bonus.

So let me just tell you what every American family would have realized had the President signed our balanced budget bill into law, the same bill that he instead vetoed. Again, remember that we want incomes to go up while taxes go down so that every American family can earn more and keep more of what they earn. So here is the balanced budget bonus, because I do not think that you will get much disagreement here in Washington or across the land. Most economists, and I recognize that economists can often be wrong, but I believe this is one case where, as Mary Chapin Carpenter said, the stars might lie, but the numbers never do, the economists widely agreed the balanced budget would have led to a drop in interest rates by as much as 2 percentage points. That would save the typical American family between $1,600 and $1,800 annually on an average home mortgage. It would save the typical American family $174 on an average car loan, $216 on the average student loan, and if you add to that the $500 per child tax credit, a typical family of four, that is, two adult parents and two children, that typical family of four would have received a balanced budget bonus of $2,990, so let us call it $3,000.

If I ask you, my colleagues, when was the last time that an American family got a $3,000 average bonus, 29 million American families would have benefited from our $500 per child tax credit, and nearly 4 million American families would have had their entire Federal tax burden eliminated? And that is real relief from the Clinton crunch.

But the President stood in the way of this balanced budget bonus for families. He vetoed the balanced budget and tax cuts for families and economic growth. Far from feeling our pain, as again he promised back in 1992, the President has become the cause of it.

So I wanted to just remind my colleagues that while President Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut when he ran for President, again he made that the centerpiece of his economic plan, Putting People First, he raised taxes instead.

So, again, as I said earlier, there is a certain juxtaposition or irony in the fact that President Clinton promised a middle-class tax cut and Republicans want to deliver one.

What we got from President Clinton and congressional Democrats, we all know now, was the largest tax increase in history. As I mentioned earlier, it passed without a single Republican vote.

Later President Clinton himself admitted that tax increase was a big mistake. He actually told an audience of major Democratic Party donors in Houston that he realized in hindsight that he had made a mistake by raising taxes so high, but then he went on to infer that somehow the Republican minority in Congress had forced him to raise taxes. Nothing could be further from the truth, because again not a single Republican voted for that Clinton Democratic tax increase back in 1993.

□ 1345

His tax increase not only raises taxes on the rich, but on the middle class, the poor, senior citizens, and American small businesses, which are the backbone of our economy. These are the very businesses which create most new jobs in America. These are the small and very small companies that give us most of our new job creation, most of our economic growth in the private sector. These are companies typically with 10 or fewer employees accounting for 70 percent of all American businesses.

The President and congressional Democrats like to claim they only raised taxes on the rich. But according to the Internal Revenue Service, nearly 87 percent of tax returns showing $200,000 or more in annual income were filed by small businesses and family businesses. These are business owners. Many times these are family businesses, but these are business owners who are organized as a partnership or sole proprietorship or sole corporation. So when the President talks about raising taxes on the rich, he is not talking about General Motors. These business taxes most impact that hardware store owner on Main Street.

Second, the President's tax and spend policies have turned a healthy economy into an economy that is on the

verge of recession. More jobs were created in the last 6 months of the Bush administration than in the last 6 months of the Clinton administration. The economy was growing 3 times faster in President Bush's last year in office than it did under President Clinton last year. In fact, for the last quarter of 1995, the most recent economic statistics, the economy grew barely at all, a growth rate of 0.9 percent annually, according to the Commerce Department.

So I go back to my original premise. The failing Clinton economy, with its income stagnation and economic insecurity, is the direct result of the Clinton-Democratic high tax, big-government policies. We have record high taxes, record high spending, excessive regulatory costs, and 25 consecutive years of deficit spending that have sucked trillions of dollars out of the economy.

So it is really little wonder that wages are stagnant, because the Government got your pay raise. So I believe that unless we reverse these policies, the policies that President Clinton and the congressional Democrats put in place, there will be no relief from the Clinton crunch. They believe, the President and the liberal congressional Democrats, believe higher taxes, increased Federal spending, and more Federal programs will lead to more and better jobs and higher pay.

We Republicans, on the other hand, believe that lower taxes, less government, and a balanced budget are the surest way to more jobs and more take-home pay for the average working American.

So we are working hard back here in Washington, and that is why we wanted to take this time to present a special order on the House floor, to emphasize we are working hard to reverse the economic effects of the Clinton crunch on the average American family and the average American worker. We believe again that the right approach is tax cuts for families and for economic growth, an end to the excessive regulations that stifle wages and increase prices and create a constant drag on economic growth and job creation, and a balanced budget, which is just terribly important, to make it easier ultimately for American families to balance their own budgets.

So again I thank the gentleman for organizing the special order and yielding the time to me.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Thank you, Mr. RIGGS, the gentleman from California. Your comments were right on when it comes to the fact that most citizens want to make sure the raise they get stays in their pocket so they can spend it for their family, their community, in the ways they have to, and not have big brother, so to speak, take their funds and use it and waste it. We have seen a lot of waste.

Under your proposals, the probusiness, projobs legislation you have filed, I am hopeful that Congress will pass it, and not only will your district benefit in California, but the whole country will. We appreciate your leadership on continuing the dialog and getting the legislation adopted.

I go back to the gentleman from Florida with regard to some issues dealing with keeping jobs and making sure that Government is decreased in responsible ways. We discussed jointly our interest in having sunset review of Federal regulations, which has been introduced in the House, and also sunset review of Federal agencies.

I know that in Pennsylvania we had legislation like that adopted, and we were able to sunset agencies that were not doing their job, or consolidate them, privatize them, eliminate them, because they were not meeting their original mission from 50 to 100 years ago.

I wanted your thoughts on what you have heard from your Florida constituents with regard to properly downsizing those programs which have outlived their usefulness.

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding. First of all, I think it is important in every level, every walk of life, for a review. When you create an agency or commission or a study or a rule, I do not think it was ever meant to be perfected in its entirety throughout its lifetime. I think in Florida we always would call back a commission or authority or issue for a 5-year review, to find out if it is doing what it was established to do. Is it operating within the guidelines? Is it spending appropriately the public's funds? Obviously that is the No. 1 component. Are they spending the public resources correctly?

These are the things I think a sunset review would provide for us. Think about it: the Department of Energy established in 1978 under the Carter administration because of the fuel crisis, and we were to set our thermostats to 78.

Look at what that agency has become. Now, are we indeed saving energy in America? Consumption is up almost in every category. Has it fulfilled its usefulness? I do not think there is anything wrong with analyzing agency-by-agency on a frequent basis its need, its necessity, and cost effectiveness for the consumer.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman would yield, that is exactly what we do in private industry. When companies look each year or each 5 years to where they are going and where they have been, they analyze every department, every single activity, to see whether the cost benefit is there, whether they have achieved their original goal, and whether there is a way to change.

Frankly, we can take a page out of business and make Government more responsive, giving the people their money's worth, and making sure that tax dollars are being spent wisely. Because frankly, some programs are best handled by of the private sector.

You only have to look at Habitat for Humanity and other good organizations like that that are community-driven and people-driven that do not depend on taxpayer dollars, but rather on sweat equity, and the involvement and caring of clergy and community and citizens, in making sure that they take abandoned houses and turn them into homes, and they really make a difference.

So we need to be reaching out, applauding, supporting, and buttressing the private sector everywhere we can, and making sure we realize that not every need is answered by a Federal program, but maybe sometimes through a private sector initiative.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman will yield, you mentioned Habitat for Humanity. That is a prime example. People say, when we go looking into HUD, that we, the Republicans, are evil, mean-spirited, we do not want to provide housing.

You just mentioned Habitat. In Okeechobee County, the McArthur Dairy Foundation deeded over 35 former housing units, single-family homes, to the Habitat for Humanity. About 2 weeks ago I went to the dedication of a home that a woman and her four children were about to move into. Through sweat equity, determination, perseverance, she was now in a single-family home, the girls and boys had their own bedrooms, and they had a home to call their own, pride of ownership. They worked on it. It was their home. It was in the neighborhood. It was not something HUD did for them.

It was not something they were trapped in. Here, this is your rental quota and this is what you get every month and you can't move, and this is not really your home, it is a rental home and subsidized. You feel these constant strings attached by government.

Habitat has given people the willingness to succeed, to own, to be proud of, and to prosper. That is the difference in what our philosophies are when we start talking about where we want our Nation to go.

Privatization in Florida: The Department of Commerce is becoming the ''Enterprise Florida,'' which is made up of large corporations. If corporations think it is great to promote the State and its opportunities, that is a role for corporations. Not the State or Federal treasury to prop up organizations that do not really promote.

The Commerce Department, you are only lucky enough to get on a Commerce trip if you have donated significantly to either a Democratic or Republican President. You do not get to go because of a novel or unique opportunity or invention.

So when we talk about downsizing, Mr. FOX, I think we have to be very, very aggressive and outline what we hope for the outcomes, that we are in fact liberating companies, businesses, individuals, to seek their own opportunities, rather than stifling them.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I think that will come with our legislation to have sunset review and also working with Congressman MICA in regulatory review, because many times I have seen where we have had Federal regulations introduced, there are already State agencies that do that. So there is no reason to have duplicative legislation, which puts a further burden on business, and we put a further burden on business that is already being covered, the safety hazard has been addressed. Why should we put the further burden on business to do more forms that do not help safety, but add to the cost of a product and therefore make it more difficult to hire.

Mr. FOLEY. Think with about your own family. When you are planning something for your future, I am certain you and Judy sit down and go over the pros and cons of a situation, you review where you are currently, where you hope to be, but you do it through a deliberative fashion. In Government it is we who have set it up, we have done our job, let us leave it alone and forget it. And that I think is a significant problem, because there is no oversight, no checking up on the kind of initiatives that were proposed and whether they yield any benefits.

So sunset review, your initiative to push and pursue this legislation, it is vitally important for Congress to become more efficient and effective.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I want to change gears if I could to go back to something I heard you speak about on the House floor recently, and I helped vote and work for the bill that you introduced to save the Everglades. While the Everglades are not in my part of the country in the sense it is not in Pennsylvania, we, who have to be stewards of the environment and conservation for future generations, have to look at the country as a totality and try to help and make sure we preserve natural areas. So I have to applaud you for your leadership in having your legislation adopted, which will in fact make sure the Everglades are maintained in their present form.

You might tell me further illustratively what was due to happen with regard to the Everglades for which we had the legislation come up to begin with?

Mr. FOLEY. As everyone knows that follows the environment and particularly the Everglades, because of growth, 5 million population in south Florida, 41 million visitors to our State last year from Pennsylvania, New York, and all throughout the great 50 States and throughout the entire continent and the globe, visited our State, and obviously that impact has greatly affected the water quantity and quality going into the Everglades.

The Everglades is one of the motion unique National Forest Park water systems, and one we are all immensely proud of. What we are doing with the $210 million appropriated last week is acquiring additional lands to buffer the Everglades, almost acting like a kidney in a body, to filter the water as it comes through these areas, and then taking the nutrients or phosphorus contents away and allowing cleaner water to flow into the Everglades and the Florida Bay.

It is vitally important for the sustaining of life. No human life, no plant life, no animal, can survive without water. So basically this is a step in the right direction of helping the Everglades.

But what I wanted to fundamentally point out, and you mentioned Mr. MICA from Florida. Mr. MICA stated very clearly in a press account that the Republicans are not against the environment. Clearly by their vote for this $210 million, we have stepped up to the plate of committing Federal resources to a vital, national interest park.

But what we are tired of spending our money on is study after study, report after report, consultants, lawyers and others, giving us ideas that are never carried out. Here we have for the first time dollars allocated to the project for actual construction and work, for something we can go back and talk about tangibly, as a result of Federal action rather than inaction.

So one of the things that I want to stress when we talk about the environment is that we are not antienvironment. The Speaker of the House came to the floor and spoke of the Everglades, announced we had to do this, the time had arrived for us to work together collectively for the Everglades. It is about making certain that the monies we are appropriating actually end up in the critical areas that need our attention.

So that is why I was proud. You marshalled the troops from Pennsylvania and your northeast corridor, because, again, as you clearly stated, this is not a Pennsylvania issue, but it is a national issue. It proves for all that enjoy the vast wonders of our continent, the Grand Canyon, you name the desert, the parks, the Allegheny Forests, all of the things we enjoy together as a nation, our pursuit of the preservation of those national resources should be first and foremost on our minds. Not whether we are getting rated on a vote, this is a good environmental vote or what have you. It is about are the dollars we are spending as a nation being applied effectively to solving problems.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. With regard to Florida generally, is there a conservation board within the State with which you work?

Mr. FOLEY. Actually there are a number of things. We have a number of initiatives. We have the Preservation 2,000 fund, the Carl Land programs, we have obviously the Audubon, Everglades National Park, a number of different groups that are very intricately involved in the process. South Florida Water Management, Corps of Engineers, Fish and Wildlife, all are looking for solutions.

That is another thing that I think is important, is to look at the broad opportunities we have as a nation to solicit input from a variety of groups. Not any one individual or group has the right answer for any given question of the day. It is seeking compromise, seeking consensus, and getting the agencies all together in the same room and saying we have a common mission, we have a common problem. Let us solve it with a common solution, rather than 100 different solutions that end up not getting the problem addressed.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I am sure your colleagues would want to have updates on a regular basis of what is happening with the Everglades, and it will be important to the body.

Mr. FOLEY. It is essential they be forthcoming, because after I have asked for that commitment of resources, that is the largest single appropriation ever in our Federal history toward the Everglades, the dollar amount. Two hundred was allocated by the Senate, Mr. DOLE specifically, and Senators MACK and GRAHAM, both Florida members Democrat and Republican, led the initiative in the Senate. Of course, we had a bipartisan coalition in the House. I think they deserve the followup to that expenditure, to see that the dollars they spend in fact are working. I know they will.

□ 1400

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. You know when we talk about the environment; you know Earth Day is coming up in April; it occurs to me that for us to continue the environmental movement started some years ago and to carry on the issues that Major Carson, an environmental leader, started in the years before that by other conservationists, I am wondering whether we are doing enough to inform, educate, and inspire youth to go into fields that deal with conservation, that deal with community participation, even if it is not going to be a profession, in those areas of environmental preservation, and whether you had thought about programs in your district and for the country which would accentuate that and would promote it.

Mr. FOLEY. Yes, I spoke to Forestdale High School yesterday, and they have a class, an actual magnet program, on environmental studies. It is the youth of the community working in a classroom setting, learning about the environment.

Again, one of the things that I want to stress, too, is the fact that one of my concerns with the government is the fact that we do have so many agencies doing similar functions with different agendas and different mandates. I think the young people need to get involved and look at the practical applications of environmental sciences because there is a cause and effect. I have always suggested that farming and the environment can coexist with the right guidelines and the right tools. I think it is important that we train our young people to understand, yes, recycling is a viable method of

preserving our Earth and also to consider all of the other aspects of how can a business coexist with an environmental movement and not look at them as enemies. And ofttimes you try to draw lines, if you are for business, you are against the environment; if you are for the environment, you are against business; and I think we have clearly indicated with our cooperation with the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and others to try and make that connection that we can make it happen.

The EPA has a tremendous program in Louisiana, which is a fast-track approach to permitting. They are doing a good job, and I will commend them for that. It is a leadership environmental movement within the EPA, but they actually work hand and hand with business, they get together with them and get their executives on board early so they can streamline the permitting process and in fact encourage that dialog so, No. 1, the company's resources are not expended unnecessarily. It is a cooperative effort, so you got both sides working for harmonious relationships, and the reports from both the corporation and from the EPA were a resounding success.

There are things in our Government that I think we need to work on to exemplify and highlight so the public says, you know, these people are serious about helping the environment, but they are not just going to sit there and throw billions of dollars at it and say now we feel good in our conscience because we have spent money and that should solve everyone's problems.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman would yield, what you say about fast tracking we see in Pennsylvania under the leadership of our new Governor, Tom Ridge, who was a former member of this body, where he has taken a leadership role on restructuring our State Department of Environmental Resources such that fast tracking for permitting and working with industry and the environmentalists is taking place. That cooperative role where government is becoming user friendly is what Governor Ridge of Pennsylvania is all about, and I think that is going to go a long way, hopefully, toward getting government more responsive to people's needs.

Speaking of being responsive, I wanted to highlight one of the legislative initiatives that you and the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, have worked on, and that is the lockbox for savings deficit reduction, and remember there is an interesting story you had in committee where you were able to reduce a budget item that you felt was wasteful only to find that the funds taken from one wasteful item was given to another pet project for someone else's district, and I believe that your lockbox legislation with Congressman CRAPO will in fact ameliorate that problem, and if you can outline that further for our colleagues, I would appreciate it.

Mr. FOLEY. Just a quick summary for those listening:

I went to an authorizing committee of the Committee on Science and withdrew an amendment for 25 million of spending. I had not a unanimous, but a majority support for the cancellation of this wasteful spending, 25 million. It turns out a day later one of my colleagues found the 25 million that I cut and immediately inserted it into another program.

Now, I would work very, very hard in order to save the taxpayers 25 million. In this process everybody says, ''Oh, MARK, 25 million, that's no money. You're not talking serious dollars. That's a nickel and dime.'' And I thought to myself never let me think that 25 million is not significant money. But they went and put the 25 million on another project.

Well, at that time I heard about Mr. CRAPO's lockbox, which is a phenomenal technique meaning I could cut that 25 million, but before it goes anywhere I designate it to the lockbox. That means just like a Christmas club account, or a savings account, or a travel account that a family sets up. That money is earmarked for deficit reduction only. So basically the mechanism would take the 25 million, put it in the expense account but, more importantly reduce the appropriations authorized for that committee by a like amount so no longer would they have the wherewithal to bump up other projects since you save money, and that is critical in order to bring the deficit down.

If we do not establish some mechanism for savings where a Member can actually not only take credit for wasteful spending, but can take credit for deficit reduction, then all of our work and efforts is for naught because you start competing against regions and areas.

The 25 million was important to certain districts, they were upset, but bottom line: everybody recognized it for what it was, a wasteful spending. But if we do not have a mechanism by which to save those dollars, to put them aside and to reduce the Federal deficit, this Nation will never achieve any fiscal sanity.

So the lockbox is critical. We are working to get it into House legislation overall and to get the Senate to adopt it, and thereby, if a Fox amendment is offered to reduce spending in a unwarranted project, if it reaches the majority consensus that the spending is unwarranted and that it should be in a lockbox, we can achieve those victories one at a time. With a $1.6 trillion budget we have got a long way to go based on $1.4 trillion of income and the rest excess spending, we have got a long way to go to reduce our Federal dependency on dollars and to wean us off of a natural addiction toward spending.

Lockbox is the only answer that I have found in all of my budgetary pursuits that works, and the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO] is to be commended, as are other Members, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LARGENT], yourself, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. MYRICK], a number of people that stood up and fought for this initiative, and we do not want to see that initiative lost in this Congress.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate your leadership in that and others in moving forward on it. I know that we can achieve, as far as I am concerned, the balanced budget that we talked about at the top of this hour if we continue making sure that we find the common ground, that we work overtime in making sure that the issues that we hold so dear, whether it be Medicare, Medicaid, environment, education; those are not just one party's issues or one branch of the Government's issues. They are everyone's issues, and we are working on them as well as anyone else is, and on Medicare I might say I think we have made some real progress. When the original debate started out on Medicare, we only learned this past April that in fact the President's trustees told us there was going to be a shortfall, Medicare would be out of business in 7 years.

So I think we have done the bipartisan, correct thing in advancing legislation which will in fact make sure that Medicare is preserved, protected, and extended, but doing it; the way we take care of the problem I think is legislation that is going to eliminate the fraud, abuse and waste. I was amazed to find; I do not know if you were; that there is $30 billion a year now wasted in fraudulent, inflated claims and billing for services not rendered by providers, and I do not know if you have researched that as well and found that to be the case.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, that is what we know about. I mean the problem with Medicare, the fraud and abuse that is being perpetrated on the taxpayers is so pervasive and so difficult to track that I think in my heart if we merely went after that with the full force and weight of the Federal Government and put the resources behind it we would probably save enough to hopefully balance not only Medicare, but lead us to a balanced budget in our Nation. There is a lot of waste and fraud. But I will tell you one thing about Medicare because there is a hue and a cry by the other side of shame on you, and GOP stands for get old people, and you are destroying Medicare.

When I went to the district, and I am the first among freshmen Congressmen with the largest number of Medicare recipients I am No. 7 in the Nation of all Members of Congress with the most Medicare recipients, we would have often 150 to 200 people attend the hearings, and when I explain the program, stay in traditional Medicare, do not change premiums, stay the same, no different than they would have been, they become more comfortable, they find that they can go to a managed care physician, care network or a medical savings account more and more comforted. The fact is if they choose a

product that they do not like, the following year they can disenroll in that and reenroll in something else or go back to traditional Medicare, and the options and ranges of options created in the plan do not deny benefits, in fact encourage opportunities for seniors.

One person at a town hall meeting said, ''You know, I like chiropractic care and it is not covered under Medicare; why not?'' I said, well, in the medical savings account you could make that discretionary choice with the moneys we provide in your account to spend on the health care you think best suits your appropriate condition, 7.5-percent increase. I mean, everything, when I finished the hearings I did not get but one or two persons still disapproving, and often that was more of a partisan than it was a practical disagreement.

What they were saying was you know you have comforted me knowing, first of all, it is not going out of business if you get your bill enacted. Second, choices. Third, competition. Fourth, we are not creating a new commission for fraud, waste and abuse; it stays with Donna Shalala, it stays with HHS. We are getting a hotline and increased enforcement in penalties, but the Medicare bill for the first time provides a road map for our system to make certain that seniors, ourselves included some day when we make that golden year, are in fact provided for, not a Band-aid, not a political let us ignore it until it really becomes a crisis. Let us look at it now strategically and make certain Medicare is something we can all be proud of in the year 2010, 2020, and beyond.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What is interesting is the President and the First Lady a couple a years ago said the way to solve the Medicare crisis is to make sure we control the rate of growth, and that is exactly what the majority proposal was and is, so hopefully we can work together with the White House, and both sides of the aisle and both Chambers, the House and Senate, to make sure we save Medicare for our seniors. We want that quality health care to be there for them and to make sure it is a system that is not just going to stop in the year 2002.

Mr. FOLEY. One other item, line-item veto. That seems to be a significant legislative initiative passed by this body. I hope we are going to be able to flush that out and get it passed by the Senate and onto the President for his signature.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Well, we passed a version early on in the 104th Congress, first session. The Senate passed a slightly different version. But I am hopeful that this bill will get to the President and a compromise version after the conferees have met because line-item veto like 43 Governors have in the country, the chance to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse, that exists. My own Governor, Governor Ridge, has a chance in Pennsylvania to eliminate those programs that are just pork barrel, just in there for one Representative or Senator and not really there to have permanent, long-term value for our Nation. And the line-item veto is an idea whose time has certainly arrived.

Mr. FOLEY. Well, if you think about the debate that can occur, and when people say line-item veto, what power does that give the President? Well, just like you mentioned with your Governor, they can strike through the appropriation as wasteful pork spending without having to veto an entire bill. But the safeguard for Congress is if a President, and a lot of people say, well, they can take retribution against a Member. If the President does not like Congressman FOLEY, he can strike out all of his projects. Well, if my projects are so good, I can go back to the floor after the veto and defend them among my colleagues and get an override within the next couple of days to restore the project.

So I do not sense this disastrous consequence of a line-item veto. In fact, I sense that there could be a bigger opportunity for us to really tighten the rein of Government, and give the President an active hand in budgetary negotiations, and in fact strike through some of these things you read about, these studies, asparagus studies, or, you know, this and that study, none of which lead to any better prosperity for anyone that has a response to the study. It is just another give-back to communities, a little pork barrel spending that I think has to stop. Line-item veto is the only mechanism in which to do that.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. And with two other programs which have been adopted, that one is soon to be signed by the President hopefully, as soon as the compromise version is agreed to, but two other bills I think of note that this 104th Congress has passed and the President has signed, one would be the accountability law which says all the laws we pass are now also applied to the Congress. Prior Congresses said, well, the fair labor standards, civil rights law, family leave does not apply to our employees.

Now, how can we in heavens understand the bills if they do not affect us too? Well, now those laws do apply to us, and we, as well, passed legislation dealing with unfunded mandates, local government, State government. We are all told by prior Congresses, well, look, we are going to send you this bill, you are going to have to do it. If it costs money? That is too bad, we are not sending you any.

Well, this new Congress has said, and the President agreed and signed the bill, saying no more unfunded mandates. If we think it is such a good idea, then we are going to send the money back to local districts so we do not bankrupt townships and towns and burroughs and villages just because we think here in Congress it is such a good idea.

Mr. FOLEY. If the gentleman would yield, if you can imagine how in name the process is that allows the memberships to pass bills onto other people and not have them impact their own lives or their own offices.

When I first toured the Capitol complex after being elected, I go to many offices looking for which one I may potentially select in the draw, and in front of every door that had, you know, the exits out into the hallways were books and computers and desks blocking the exists. There was generally in most offices one exit remaining open.

Now in a business, OSHA, the fire marshall, everyone would have cited that facility for not having a proper escape for an employee.

□ 1415

Here in Congress they can do whatever they want, clog up the offices, junk everywhere, and they consider that fair.

Civil rights laws, fair labor standards, all the things that we impose on small businesses, Members of Congress sat back and said, ''Oh, no, but I am holier than thou. I do not need to enforce those laws on ourselves, because we are in fact the Congress. We are the superior body of mankind.'' I think it was that attitude that got this Congress into such trouble.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] would be glad to know that we will now have a change in that, as the person who started the firefighters' caucus in the Capitol. I am sure he will take the initiative to work with the appropriate authority to change that.

It is also interesting to note that we have taken not only reform measures when it comes to fiscal responsibility, but we have changed how we run the institution. We have one-third less committee staff. We have in fact also made sure that the pensions that Members receive are now not special, they are the same as any other Federal employee. We have eliminated the right of lobbyists to give us gifts. Our constituents do not get gifts, except at holiday time and birthdays. Why should we have anything special as well? We also have passed lobbying disclosure, and campaign reform is in the offing, very shortly to be passed. There are several good bills out there, I think, to make campaign reform a reality.

So this Congress is different. We are getting our fiscal house in order with a line item veto, with a balanced budget, stopping the unfunded mandates. But the reforms of the Congress itself have also come about when it comes to how we operate the institution. Hopefully that will continue as we move forward.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield a final moment, I want to thank him very much. I thank him for this excellent opportunity to portray the things we are trying to do, to balance the budget, and for his leadership on a number of issues.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to address the House and my colleagues.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. ROGERS). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 3 p.m.

□ 1501

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS) at 3 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair will now put the question on approval of the Journal and then on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which the motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal; de novo;

H.R. 2778, de novo; and

H.R. 2853, de novo.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

SPECIAL TAX TREATMENT FOR UNITED STATES TROOPS IN BOSNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question de novo of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2778, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BUNNING] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2778, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—416

Ackerman
Allard
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bryant (TX)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chapman
Christensen
Chrysler
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Coleman
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooley
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis
de la Garza
Deal
DeLauro
DeLay
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Fields (TX)
Filner
Flake
Flanagan
Foglietta
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Frost
Funderburk
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Jones
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Latham
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Longley
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Martini
Mascara
Matsui
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Murtha
Myers
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Poshard
Pryce
Quillen
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reed
Regula
Richardson
Riggs
Rivers
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roth
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Salmon
Sanders
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stockman
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thornton
Thurman
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Yates
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—15

Abercrombie
Brown (FL)
Chenoweth
Collins (MI)
DeFazio
Durbin
Ehrlich
Kaptur
LaTourette
Lipinski
McCarthy
Morella
Ortiz
Stokes
Wynn

□ 1523

Mr. SCARBOROUGH changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today the House considered on the suspension calendar, H.R. 2778, a bill to give special tax treatment to United States troops in Bosnia. As a strong supporter of the members of our Armed Forces I strongly support this measure. Had I been present on roll No. 44 I would have noted ''aye.''

MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR BULGARIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2853.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.