

could yield to me so that I could have the opportunity to answer the question that he asked of me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is unable to recognize that unanimous-consent request. The gentleman is limited to 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, how many additional people are there on the list, sir?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Approximately 15.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with going back and forth between Democrat and Republican, is it not true that a Democrat can ask for unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak out of order and then the gentleman from Mississippi can get 5 minutes if no one objects?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

□ 1345

A BALANCED BUDGET?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GANSKE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry before we go on.

I understand what is at stake here. But is the ruling of the Chair about continuing because, if we start this process, that means those who have signed up will have to wait a longer time? Is that the reason for proceeding this way?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair cannot recognize Members for extensions of 5-minute special orders.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I understand. I thank the Chair.

I have the time, Mr. Speaker, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to my friend from Georgia, and I do consider him my friend, that what the coalition and what I hope every Member of this body is asking for is honesty in budgeting.

I did some checking yesterday from the Congressional Budget Office, and even the Republican budget for 1996 would run up a \$296 billion annual operating deficit; \$118 billion of that would be taken from trust funds.

I have continually heard that bill being referred to on the floor of the House of Representatives as the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. Sir, that is not a balanced budget. I think the gen-

tleman knows that, and I know that, I think the people of America ought to know that.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, following up on Mr. TAYLOR's comment, as you know, yesterday I started what I said would be a series of discussions as to what constitutes a balanced budget in the context of the Speaker's admonition to us that we use honest numbers.

I invited the Speaker to come down and discuss that if he wants. He is not here today. I do not know whether he will be here tomorrow. I am going to be here right through the 15th. He may be in negotiations right now, I do not know, about this so-called balanced budget. But every time we see on television or hear on radio or read in the newspaper the Speaker talking about a balanced budget in 7 years and using honest numbers, I submit to you and I submit to him and would be very happy to have a discourse with him that this is illusionary. This is entirely illusory in nature. These numbers do not reflect an honest balanced budget.

As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] indicated, every single budget proposed from the years 1996 through 2002 has a massive deficit attached to it in the Republican plan. Every single one of those budgets is going into the Social Security trust fund. It is stated right in the budget documents of the Republican proposals, and I do not object at any time to someone coming forward with the idea of saying let us get to a balanced budget as I indicated yesterday.

In time to come, I will come on this floor and propose the kind of alternatives that some of us are putting together and are willing to get behind that which will achieve that in an honest way. This is dishonest in the sense that you are putting forward, or we are having put forward to us by the majority the idea that somehow they have exclusive claim to a balanced budget.

I will indicate that this year alone, and I may be off \$1 or \$2 billion, a couple of billion dollars depending on what the final figures come out to be, but the proposal is that they take \$63 billion from a so-called surplus in the Social Security system.

Mr. KINGSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will yield briefly because I have got a long way to go and you folks are on the floor every single day with this line and you have hundreds of people saying the same things, and we are just a couple of us here right now. But I will yield for the moment.

Mr. KINGSTON. I would say this to my friend from Hawaii whom I know to be a learned and honest gentleman. This is an 18-inch ruler, and what is unbelievable to me that over here 18 inches may be different, if we were talking money on the other side of the aisle, and I agree with what you and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] and the gentlewoman from

Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] are saying, let us use the same ruler when we debate this so that balance really is balance. No deficit really means no deficit.

So I would say to you in the spirit of let us get to the bottom of it, I am with you 100 percent on what your assertion is. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. To enter into a dialog with you on this, then, is it your position that the budget as put forward by the majority at the present time is not going to balance the budget if at the end of 2002 we have almost \$1 trillion owing to the Social Security trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. If we are making by a ruler that is the same ruler that we measure all plans on and that is the case, then we need to look at it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If you could be so kind, would you try and answer my question. Is it the Republican budget position that in the year 2002 when you have ostensibly balanced the budget that you will owe the Social Security trust fund \$636 billion plus interest, approximately \$1 trillion will be owing to the trust fund?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this. Last night was the first night that I listened to what you are saying and it raised something that I want to go back and do my homework on. But I can assure you that I would be happy to answer that question afterwards and continue a dialog in an honest manner.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, do I have time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Ten seconds.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I very much appreciate the honesty of the gentleman from Georgia. I will indicate to him and to the rest of the House that if they go back and do their homework as he suggests, they will find that in the year 2002 we will owe almost \$1 trillion to the Social Security trust fund, and in the time to come, Mr. Speaker, over the next couple of weeks I am sure we can explore this issue at greater depth. I thank the Speaker very much and the gentleman from Georgia.

BOSNIA

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

BALANCING THE BUDGET

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, just to follow up briefly, I was going to be talking on Bosnia but to follow up briefly on what the gentleman said before, anybody that comes up with a plan that does more to balance the budget than what the Republican plan has done this year is fine with me. But I am hearing conflicting signals.

The first thing I am hearing is that the Republican budget does not go far enough to balance the budget. And then we turn around the next day and