

The Republican position on this issue is crystal clear and makes the most sense. Here are six common sense reasons why the appropriations language which prohibits the Census Bureau from spending money after March 1999 should remain as it is:

First, six Federal judges have ruled that sampling is illegal.

Two, there is nothing in our appropriations language which prevents the bureau from preparing for both sampling and a non-sampling census. In fact, we have worked with the bureau to make sure that they have more money in the first 6 months than in the second 6 months. We have told the bureau that they will not have any cash flow problems.

Three, in all likelihood, the Supreme Court will have decided this by March 1999. The case is on an expedited track and oral arguments are set before the Supreme Court for November 30.

Four, by March, the information from the dress rehearsal will have been reviewed and available for study.

Number five, by March, the bipartisan Census Monitoring Board will have issued its report on the 2000 Census.

And six, Congress must have a role in deciding how to conduct the 2000 Census. Without the appropriations language, the administration is free to unilaterally decide how the 2000 Census is conducted.

Our position is clear and reasonable. The Democrats fear a ruling of the Supreme Court against sampling will devastate the chances for its use in 2000. They are desperately trying to figure out a way to diminish the importance of the court case.

The common sense approach is to give the Census Bureau the money to function for the year, restrict spending after March, and wait until we have all the information needed to decide how to conduct the 2000 Census.

Mr. Speaker, I hope in the future that these House Democrats can be trusted to negotiate in good faith. At this point, after the misrepresentations of last evening's private conversations, I have grave doubts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

MORE MONEY TO IMF WILL ONLY MAKE WORLD ECONOMIC SITUATIONS WORSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by expressing my strong objection to the current legislative process in the House. Some day soon, we do not know, maybe tomorrow, maybe Friday, maybe Saturday, eight appropriations bills, which as I understand it will add up to some \$500 billion, will be dumped into one omnibus bill. Members here, with relatively little knowledge as to what is in that legislation, are going to vote for it. I think that is a pretty poor process.

What is of particular concern to me is that within that huge omnibus bill will be, as I understand it, an \$18 billion appropriation for the expansion of the IMF, the International Monetary Fund.

Now, it seems to me that in a time when we are cutting back on veterans' benefits, when 43 million Americans have no health care, when millions of middle-class families are unable to afford to send their kids to college, that maybe, just maybe, we might want to have an open debate upon the wisdom of putting \$18 billion of taxpayers' money into the IMF. Maybe we would like to hear the pros and the cons of that discussion. Maybe we would like to see an up-or-down vote on that issue. But I guess that is not going to happen.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton wants the IMF. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGRICH) wants the IMF. Every large multinational corporation in this country wants the IMF. The corporate media wants the IMF. And, I guess, they are going to get the IMF without any serious debate.

But let me just say a few words about the IMF. I happen to agree with those people who say that the international economy is in a fragile state right now and that the United States has got to act. I disagree with those people who say that the solution is to pour more money into the IMF.

In my opinion, if recent history is any indicator of what might happen in the future, giving more money to the IMF might only make a bad situation, an unstable situation even worse. All we have to do is take a hard look at what has happened throughout the world in those countries which the IMF has "helped" to understand that maybe the IMF path is not the road that we want to go down.

They "helped" the people of Mexico several years ago. Today, as a result or partially as a result of their help, the Mexican economy is in disastrous condition. Wages are down. Unemployment and child labor are up. And their Congress in Mexico is now addressing a massive bailout of their banking system.

But something did happen out of the Mexican bailout of several years ago.

That is that the investors that we bailed out, the large banks and speculators, learned a very important lesson. They learned that the taxpayers of the United States would be there no matter how ill-advised or stupid their investments might be, no matter how much money they might lose. No problem, Uncle Sam was there to bail them out.

They took that lesson to Asia, and they continued that process. They pumped huge sums of money into Thailand and Malaysia and Indonesia and South Korea. And then, when that part of the world began to suffer, no problem, the President, Mr. Rubin and Mr. Summers and everyone said well, we have got to bail them out again, and we bailed them out again.

We bailed out major banks and financial investors because we do not want them to lose any money. Small businesspeople, family farmers, hey, they can lose money. But when it's the Chase Manhattan Bank, they are not supposed to lose money. They only make money, I suppose.

Then the meltdown in Russia began. Poor Russia. It is incredible that a great country with such a tragic history has got to suffer all over again. When communism fell in 1991, the Russian Government received the attention and the guidance of the IMF and all of their wonderful policy advisors. Tragically, the Russian Government listened to them and took their advice. It is fair to say that never before in modern history has a major industrialized Nation experienced the kind of decline in a 7-year period as Russia has under IMF guidance and with \$20 billion of IMF loans.

Mr. Speaker, those people who are asking our taxpayers for \$18 billion in order to expand the functioning of the IMF are telling us that the global economy is in a fragile state, economic contagion is a reality, and that the United States could well suffer if the crisis in the global economy is not addressed.

Well, let me say this, I believe that the global economy is in a fragile state, economic contagion is a reality, and that the United States could well suffer if the crisis in the global economy is not addressed. But I very strongly differ with our friends who believe that another \$18 billion will make the situation better. In my opinion, if recent history is any indicator of what might happen in the future, giving more money to the IMF will only make a bad situation worse. Four years ago when Mexico was in dire economic circumstances Mr. Rubin, Mr. Greenspan, President Clinton, Mr. GINGRICH, corporate America, and all of the Corporate media told us that we would have to pony-up and bail out investors who had lost money in that country. We were told that if Mexico went under the contagion would spread, and there would be an international economic disaster would occur. Well, some of us fought very hard against that bail out, but we lost. Today, the Mexican economy is in disastrous condition, wages are way down, unemployment and child labor are way up, and their congress is now addressing a massive bail out of their banking system.

But something did happen out of the Mexican bailout, the investors that we bailed out,