

Dutch media say the force will include 2,000 military personnel, including an armored infantry battalion, a tank squadron, one Hercules transport aircraft, two F-27 aircraft and 12 F-16 jets.

Troops from Denmark and Turkey will also join the peace force.

Non-NATO members

Russia.—2,000 combat troops and a 2,000-strong logistical support unit.

Troops from Finland, Sweden (about 870), Estonia, Hungary (about 100 technical personnel), Latvia, Lithuania and Poland will be offered to the peace force.

□ 2230

Save them from going to their libraries and looking up old Reader's Digest. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put four articles into the RECORD at this point, and then turn his own time back to Mr. ABERCROMBIE, or if I could ask unanimous consent to put them at the end of the special order of the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and myself. That keeps the special order of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] clean.

As a matter of fact, this article, "Europe Has Few Doubts on Bosnian Force," which gives the best troop breakdown on our NATO allies, and how they are not equaling what we are doing anywhere nearly close enough in manpower. This is by Craig Whitney, and I believe it is from the New York Times. Another page of facts and figures that goes with it with the same article.

I neglected to put in the Reader's Digest article last night from the October issue, "The Folly of U.N. Peacekeeping With Scandals in Bosnia, Cambodia, Somalia and Rwanda," all of the U.N. vehicles lined up at the warehouses with documents saying, try not to put your vehicles too near the night clubs, they call them.

Then I would like to put in the November article, the "United Nations Is Out Of Control," last month's Reader's Digest. This will at least bring American taxpayers to an angry point of saying, if the United Nations must be saved, it must be saved from itself. It has no accountability. They treat money like it grows on trees. None of them pay taxes, nobody is accountable.

Again, I want to close on this picture, a two-page spreadout, the same one that is on the front page of the L.A. Times, of Clinton in Bosnia with the troops, our forces there; here it is; and I am all through with this one last picture, even though it is going to be a long shot. There is Clinton with all the top sergeant majors, the commanding general whose biography I would like to put in at this point, as I am going to put in the history of first armored division fighting from Algiers, Tunisia, Anzio, Salerno, and all the way up into the area where BOB DOLE was so savagely wounded. How did Clinton set this up where he said to all of these people, will you follow me? Will you follow me down this driveway, chin up in the air like Mussolini, jaw jutted out, neck muscles flexing, and there he

walks saying, follow me, but only as far as the reviewing field. You will go on to Bosnia by yourselves; I will be back in the White House thinking about a 7-year balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and I would say to the gentleman, what goes around comes around. I will do it for you sometime, NEAL.

MAGIC FORMULA FOR BALANCED BUDGET IS ILLUSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LONGLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, Mr. DORNAN has given me, with his last sentence, literally a transition point for the issue that I wish to discuss this evening yet once again, and that has to do with the so-called balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, and certainly others of our colleagues who have been paying attention to both debate during the bills at hand, and in special orders with respect to the budget reconciliation bill, that I have, among others, been saying for some time now, that this magic formula that is being proposed by the majority about a balanced budget is in fact an illusion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, rather than just taking into consideration the observation of the majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, the other day that politicians could get hit by a train and get back up and say I got the best of that deal, so therefore, we cannot pay much attention to politicians, let me make some references then to some of the people in the press, some of the journalists who have been doing their homework on this issue. Here is the fundamental premise, Mr. Speaker.

I am maintaining that there is no balanced budget in 7 years. What bothers me is that most journalists, when they report this, and when I say most journalists I am talking across the board up to and including public radio and public television, all of the networks, they simply report what is said and then what the reaction to that is as if they were covering a tennis match from one side to the other. Nobody asked the basic question of the Speaker of the House, who has, despite his indications that he was going to take a more reticent position, to step back; I think he said he was going to bench himself.

In the last 2 days the Speaker has come forward with threats about crashing the stock market, driving interest rates through the roof, demanding that his plan for a balanced budget be the basis of the budget reconciliation bill.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to you and to my other colleagues, and I have offered again and again during special orders the opportunity to other Members to

come down and refute what I am saying. It is not that I want to engage in a contest, because this is far too important for trying to score points, but it is a simple question of whether we are in fact, as Mark Twain has said that the truth is so rare we ought to be very careful in spending it.

The fact of the matter is that there is no balanced budget proposal on the table. There is no balanced budget proposal on the table that is being negotiated between Speaker GINGRICH and the White House. I say Speaker GINGRICH; I know there are other negotiators there, but I think we all know that nothing is going to move in the House, according to the Speaker, in any event today, if I am to understand his declaration today correctly, that we have to abide by his proposal for a balanced budget in 7 years, or we do not move.

Now, as I say, all kinds of threats are involved in that. I am a legislator all my elected life. Maybe Speaker GINGRICH, having only run for the Congress of the United States and spent all of his time in the Congress of the United States, and for the first time being in the majority, has not had the same kind of opportunities or experiences that I have had as a legislator.

I have been a legislator as well as a member of civic organizations and community organizations; I have been an officer of them. I have been on the city council, I have been in the State House, I have been in the State Senate. I do not cite that as any particular virtue, but simply as a recitation of the record with respect to legislative experience. That experience tells me that you do not get anywhere in negotiations by threatening the other side or laying down absolutes to them, particularly when there is no basis from your side.

I am perfectly willing at any time, and I am sure members of the Democratic Caucus are and those who are doing the negotiating, up to and including the President of the United States and his representative, Mr. Pannetta, are quite willing to try to come to an agreement. This is not a Parliament. This is a constitutional system with a division of houses, a legislative and executive branch, and as much as the Speaker would like to be Prime Minister of the United States, he is not. He is the Speaker of the House. Therefore, if he is going to negotiate with the Executive, he is going to have to come to the table with some honest numbers.

He says that that is what it is that he wants to do, but the fact is, and I will repeat it again and again and again until some people I hope in the media, whom we have to depend upon; and Mr. Speaker, Mr. Jefferson said at one point that he would prefer in a democracy as opposed to free elections and a free government and a free press, he preferred a free press, because the press is what secures our freedom. Yet the free press in this particular instance has been remiss and not doing

its duty in asking the Speaker, what does he mean when he comes to the table and says a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I contend that there will be at least \$1 trillion in additional deficit in this so-called balanced budget. Now, if someone can come to the floor and refute what I am saying, I probably should not use the word refute; again, it sounds like it is a contest, but if someone can come and explain how that is not the case, Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to hear it.

Now, this is not merely an observation that I am making. Let me make reference to an article in USA Today, Monday, October 23, 1995, by William Welch. I called Mr. Welch because I was interested to see that there was actually a member of the working press who had gotten into this issue.

Let me explain to you what it is that I am contending, that is to say what is behind my contention that the proposal for a balanced budget is in fact not a balanced budget. It is a political illusion because apparently, or for whatever the political reason, the political agenda, I presume it has to do with election politics in 1996, the Speaker wants to make the claim that his party has been for a balanced budget. What he is really talking about is whether or not the deficit can be reduced.

There is not going to be a balanced budget in this century, I can assure you of that. There is not going to be a balanced budget, as the average person understands a balanced budget to be, in this century. If we adopt some reforms, some genuine budget reforms, as I have mentioned previously, like separating our capital spending from our operating budget, going to a biennial budget, and other reforms that we might take up next year, perhaps then we can move genuinely towards balancing the budget while we reduce the deficit. However, in the budget that is being proposed by the Speaker and is now the subject of negotiation, he is actually increasing the deficit. The deficit is going to increase. I can give you the exact numbers.

For fiscal year 1996, \$245.6 billion, and on through 1997 and on up to the year 2002. In the year 2002, when we are supposed to have a \$10 billion surplus, we are actually going to have a deficit of \$108.4 billion, according to the budget document that the Committee on the Budget has put forward. You need only read on page 3 of the budget document that Mr. KASICH and the Committee on the Budget put forward, which is sitting on the table down at the White House, and see that what I am saying is the case.

Let me repeat it. We are going to increase the deficit all during this time. How then is it possible for us to say that there is going to be a balanced budget? How is it possible for the Speaker, although he has never been shy, as we know, in going on television and making claims of one kind and an-

other, how is it possible for him to say that he is going to have a balanced budget? Mr. Speaker, the answer is very simple. He is not going to use the off-budget numbers.

Now, I do not think that the average American is aware of the fact that we have two different kinds of budgets here. We have accounting games that go on at the Federal Government level. We have figures that are on budget and we have figures that are off budget. Now, Mr. Welch's article is entitled "Off-budget Spending Hides Red Ink." That is not me speaking. This is the editorial judgment of USA Today in terms of those who are writing the headlines. "Off-budget Spending Hides Red Ink."

Let me quote from it for a little bit. "Senate Republicans were crowing last week," I am quoting now from Mr. Welch's article, "Senate Republicans were crowing last week after the Congressional Budget Office certified that their budget plan would bring the Federal books into balance in 7 years. But the Congressional Budget Office has another set of figures that GOP leaders are not talking about. It shows that under the GOP budget plan, the government will have to borrow at least \$105 billion in the year 2002, the target year for a balanced budget. Only in Washington, to borrow a phrase from opponents of government, would a budget dependent on continued borrowing be judged in balance."

Mr. Speaker, what that means is that Mr. Welch has hit upon the secret, the hidden secret of the Republican balanced budget: You take money from the Social Security trust fund.

Now, the fact that it is in the Treasury, the fact that it is supposedly sacrosanct in the Treasury allows them the verbal gymnastics of being able to say, well, we are not really taking the money. Well, of course you are. You are borrowing the money and you have to pay it back with interest. You are going to borrow, if you use the figures of the original budget resolution, some \$636 billion. That was the figure in January. I know that because I have a letter here dated October 20, 1995, from the Congressional Budget Office, and its Director, June O'Neill.

□ 2245

It is addressed to a Member of the U.S. Senate and copies to two other Members of the Senate, including the chairman of the Budget Committee. "Dear Senator: Pursuant to section 205(a) of the budget resolution for fiscal year 1996, the Congressional Budget Office"—and this is the office that is cited by the Speaker as being the source of his figures for this budget—"the Congressional Budget Office provided the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee on October 18 with a projection of the budget deficits or surpluses that would result from enactment of the reconciliation legislation submitted to the Budget Committee. As specified in section 205(a), the Con-

gressional Budget Office provided projections"—this is what is being used for these budget figures, Mr. Speaker, projections of the Congressional Budget Office, that was insisted upon by the Speaker.

Ms. O'Neill then has a parenthesis, "using the economic and technical assumptions underlying the budget resolution and assuming the level of discretionary spending specified in that resolution," end of parenthesis, "of the deficit or surplus of the total budget, that is, the deficit or surplus resulting from all budgetary transactions of the Federal Government, including Social Security and Postal Service spending and receipts that are designated as off-budget transactions." Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe you can get away with this in your household. I doubt it. I cannot get away with it in my household. So far as I know, there is not an American family that can get away with having off-budget transactions.

Those who do off-budget transactions find themselves in the courts. They find themselves under felony indictment for fraud. They find themselves in situations in which they are accused of kiting checks. They find themselves in a situation in which they have written checks from accounts in which there are insufficient funds, or they find themselves under the racketeering statutes under indictment in court. But for purposes of accounting, for political purposes, the Republican budget says, "Oh, we're going to count this off-budget transaction."

Now what is off-budget? All the money that comes out of your paycheck for Social Security that you are paying in right now is being, as was described by one of the Senators who very unfortunately passed away, as embezzlement from the Social Security system.

I go on, again quoting from Director O'Neill's letter of October 20 from the Congressional Budget Office: "As stated to Chairman Domenici, the Congressional Budget Office projected that there will be a total-budget surplus of \$10 billion in 2002." But the next sentence says, "Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$115 billion in 2002 from the calculation, the Congressional Budget Office would project an on-budget deficit of \$105 billion in 2002. If you wish further details on this projection, we will be pleased to provide them."

Now, Mr. Speaker, we both know that there is a new set of figures that are going to come from the Congressional Budget Office. They were supposed to arrive this week. They did not arrive. That is why the budget negotiations are stalled. We are going to get a new series of numbers.

So when I give you the number \$636 billion, that is based on what took place from the Congressional Budget Office estimates in January 1995. They have a new set of projections in August of 1995, different numbers, and I expect they will have different numbers again.

But whatever the numbers are, it is the process that counts.

Here I have a letter from the Congressional Budget Office. This is the office that Mr. GINGRICH says he wants to rely upon for the figures for his balanced budget proposal, and here you have the director of the office, in a letter written on Congressional Budget Office stationery on October 20 of this year, saying that, and I quote, "Excluding an estimated off-budget surplus of \$115 billion in 2002," parentheses, in the Social Security trust fund, "from the calculation, the Congressional Budget Office would project an on-budget deficit of \$105 billion in the year 2002."

Mr. Speaker, there is no way that you can continue to have budget deficits year after year after year, take money from Social Security, the principal and interest of which is due to the Social Security trust fund, and then not find that you have actually increased the deficit rather than balancing the budget, and increased it by a sum in excess of \$1 trillion by 2002.

When you have done that, you have not begun to deal with the question of what happens after 2002. Is the Government of the United States going to stop in 2002? When you have this magic number of 7 years associated with the balanced budget, are people in this country under the impression that suddenly in the year 2002 we are not going to owe any money? And that which we have borrowed up until 2002 somehow will be paid in 2003 and beyond by some plan which has not yet been enunciated?

Has any journalist asked the Speaker, what do you plan to do in 2003? And what do you plan to do in 2014, 2015, 2020 and 2030, when the money you have taken from Social Security is due to those who are then eligible for it? Where is the money going to come from?

Mr. Speaker, I am down on this floor, I am in the special order, it is late at night here in the East. As you go across the country, it is a little bit earlier. I know people are tuned into the Government. I hope some people are listening tonight.

I hope somebody out there understands that the Government is going to go on beyond the year 2002, and that unless you want the immediate political benefit of being able to claim that you are balancing the budget when in fact you are increasing the deficit, increasing it at a rate that is unconscionable, there is no cold war.

The deficit increased by trillions of dollars at the time of President Reagan and through President Bush's administration, in which at least the argument was made that we had a foe that we had to fight and so it was necessary to borrow this money. There was some discussion that if we ran deficits and cut taxes that more revenue would come in. That did not happen, but at least there was a rationale for it.

So history now tells us that when you increase spending, when you cut

taxes for the wealthy, when your revenues go down, that your deficit is going to increase. It is going to increase. And this does not change anything. It not only does not change it but it exacerbates the situation.

Notice again I am down here talking, I know there are other people that are out there that are familiar with the budget. I certainly do not pretend to be an all-around expert on the budget, but I tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have not been elected for more than two decades by being slow on my feet and not doing my homework.

I know that the budget is not going to be balanced. I know that the funds to offset the deficit are coming out of the Social Security trust fund, and I know that there is not a word in that budget reconciliation bill that proposes one single dollar of how that deficit is supposed to be made up, and how the money being borrowed from Social Security is going to be repaid so that the recipients who are due that money are going to be able to get it in the next century.

It is right here from the Congressional Budget Office.

Now, if people in this country want to have on-budgets and off-budgets, I suppose that we can do that. But do not tell me that is an honest number.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in the minority of the majority before. When I served in the majority, in my legislature or in the council or now in the House of Representatives, I have been in the majority and I have been in the minority, I have won elections, I have lost elections.

I have been a minority in the majority as I have said, but I will tell you this, I have never in my life, and I have served on ways and means committees and I have served as chairman of subject matter committees. So I understand what it is when you are told that you have a cap, when you have a certain amount of money that you have to spend and you have to make tough decisions. I have made thousands and thousands of those decisions, as has every other legislator who has spent any time thinking about what their legislative duty is.

And I know that when somebody tells me that there is something off-budget that can be counted, it amounts to what at the State level, Mr. Speaker, or at the county level, at the village level or town level, would be a special fund.

Now we special fund all kinds of things in the State of Hawaii, and I expect you do it in your State and everybody else does. Maybe it is the airport fund, where the fees that come in for the airport, landing fees and so on, are put into a special fund and you know that the money that comes in is going to be spent for airport activities, or highway transportation fund. People pay taxes on the gasoline that they buy and they know that the money that comes in from that the surplus, if you will, from those funds are going to be spent on highway projects.

Well, the Social Security trust fund is supposed to be for Social Security. It is not there as a piggy bank to be looted at will with an IOU in it that says, "I'll pay you back at some time in the future. Catch me on that when you can." But that is what this proposal does.

Mr. Welch has caught it. Let me go on with some more of his article.

"In figuring the Federal budget deficit, Congress does not count the government's spending from certain trust funds, principally from the fund for Social Security benefits. By law," Still quoting from Mr. Welch, "Congress has placed the Social Security trust fund off-budget." Quote, unquote.

"The surplus, the amount left after Social Security payroll taxes are used to pay benefits to current beneficiaries, is invested in Treasury securities. That money, in turn, flows into the federal treasury and is spent on everything from congressional salaries to fuel for battleships."

In other words, we have borrowed against ourselves. We have borrowed our own money. When you borrow the money, you have to pay it back. It is not a paper transaction. It is real money we are talking about here. It is money that has to be paid back.

I have asked my Republican colleagues again and again about this, and about the only answer I get is, other Democratic Presidents have done this, Democratic Congresses have done the same thing.

I am not the one who came here saying, oh, it is not going to be business as usual, we are going to change the way everything is done around here, we are going to change the Government, we are going to do things the right way, we are going to be honest with our numbers. The Speaker says that over and over and over again.

When you used off-budget numbers before, off-budget funding before for other things, it was to fund the budget for that year. Nobody was kidding themselves that they were balancing the budget. If anything, what we tried to do—and we started with President Clinton's budget, the first budget, I would remind the Speaker, since Harry Truman in 1948 that in consecutive years reduced the absolute amount of the deficit and the rate of the deficit.

Mr. Clinton's budget did not get rid of the deficit but it started us on the path. I think that the Committee on the Budget and others always use the words glide path. This has become the new catch word. A glide path. The glide path does not start with this budget—I do not want to characterize it as phony, the way the Speaker uses the word phony all the time, because that is pejorative. I am not going to say that. But what I will say is that illusionary budget, the illusion of this so-called balanced budget is such that you do not have the glide path that President Clinton started sustained.

President Clinton's budget has reduced the deficit and reduced the rate

of the deficit and has done so far 3 years running.

You cannot take it all out or the economy would collapse. This is the same kind of thing, no different than when you are trying to pay your mortgage and buy a car and get the washing machine. You figure out how much money is coming in, you figure out how much you can spend a month or over the year, and that is how you balance your budget.

It is your ability to pay, and that has to be judged against your gross income, your expected revenues. That is what banks do when they loan you money for a house. They are betting that you will be able to sustain your payments on the mortgage for whatever the period of time is for that mortgage.

Now, this is what people understand to be a balanced budget. But does anybody presume that they do not have to pay the mortgage? That when they borrow the money they do not have to pay it back or they just pay a portion of it back, that there is no plan, that there is no obligation?

We are mortgaging the Social Security trust fund so that the Speaker can say he is balancing the budget. I do not know if you will be here 7 years from now. I do not know if he is going to be here next year, unless we do change the system of government here to the prime minister or parliamentary system he seems to admire so much. I think he is subject to election just like I am and just like you are, Mr. Speaker.

We talk about 7 years as if we can commit the next Congress to this 7 years. We cannot commit the next Congress. We cannot even commit this Congress next year to what the budget allocations are going to be.

And there will be two Presidential elections before this 7 years is up. We have no idea whether President Clinton or anyone who might succeed him will have the same desires, the same plans, the same proposals.

□ 2300

But even if we grant this 7-year process and do our level best in a manner of good faith and goodwill to try to implement it, the fact still remains the question has not been answered about what do you do with the mortgage on Social Security. And unless we can answer the question that is inherent in Mr. Welch's article, it cannot be done.

Now Mr. Welch is not the only one who has brought this up. Mr. Lars-Erik Nelson, in the New York Daily News, October 20, scarcely a little over a month ago, let me quote him from the article entitled "Borrowing from Social Security to Aid the Rich," Lars-Erik Nelson, "See that social security deduction on your paycheck? It is the key to the Republican plan to 'balance' the Federal budget while giving tax cuts to the wealthy." That is not me saying it. That is Mr. Nelson's observation from reading the budget.

Again quoting, "In 2002, the year Republicans have been promising a bal-

anced budget, they will, in fact, come up \$108,000 billion short. According to the House Budget Committee's report." Now there, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you is a third party, not me, not someone with a partisan political agenda, someone else coming up with the exact same figures that I just gave you from the budget.

Again quoting, "The Republican plan makes up the different by borrowing, the late Senator John Heinz of Pennsylvania called it embezzling, from the social security trust fund."

Going on, "The Republican plan continues the embezzlement in pure accounting terms. The Republicans are right, if the amount of money the government collects in a given year equals the amount that it pays out, the budget is in balance. But borrowing from the trust fund to cover current operating costs means raising taxes on the next generation, our children, to pay back the debt to the trust fund."

I will say one thing on this, Mr. Speaker, and I hope it does not sound pejorative because I try to keep comity on the floor. I like to have good relations with all my friends and colleagues here, despite whatever differences we might have. I am getting a little sick of hearing people talk with crocodile tears about their children and their grandchildren and how the balanced budget proposal is on behalf of their children and their grandchildren. I would like those people to explain, not to me, but explain to the American people and explain to those children and grandchildren how they are taking care of those kids by upping the ante on what they have to pay for what their mothers and fathers borrowed without paying it back.

Let me read it to you again: "The Republican plan continues the embezzlement. In pure accounting terms, the Republicans are probably right." In pure accounting terms, parenthetically, in pure accounting terms, that is what the Republican Party always wants to do. The old saying is the Democrat borrow, Republicans collect interest. Hah, hah, where this balanced budget is concerned, let me tell you, that will be true with a vengeance.

Reading again from Mr. Nelson, "If the amount of money the government collects in a given year equals the amount that it pays out, the budget is in balance. But," and there is always the "but," "But borrowing from the trust fund to cover current operating costs means raising taxes on the next generation, our children, to pay back the debt to the trust fund."

I have yet, Mr. Speaker, despite my best efforts, and as I say, I believe I am open and available to anybody on either side of the aisle on this, I have asked again and again of my friends with whom I have had discussions of varying lengths about this issue, how do you propose to pay back the money to the Social Security fund? Nobody that I speak to, by the way, Mr. Speaker, on this issue denies to me that this

is what is going to happen, that this is how the budget ostensibly is being balanced.

Now I will repeat, I could not get away with this in my family. I could not get away with it. I do not know of a Member here that can get away with it in their own family budgeting. It cannot be done. We propose to do it and get away with it. The press is letting this slide. This is almost the only way we have to try and get this out is to take advantage of the fact that we have our special orders and hope that somebody in the press, like Mr. Nelson, like Mr. Welch, will pick up on it and begin to explain to people from the Fourth Estate, from the press, from someone who is not directly involved in the political process, from partisan views, partisan viewpoints, begin to explain to people what exactly is happening.

In addition, quoting again from Mr. Nelson, "In addition, using Social Security deductions to balance the budget means that working people who cannot escape that FICA deduction," that is what is called the FICA deduction, that is your social security deduction, who cannot not escape that deduction on their paychecks make up the shortfall caused by tax breaks for the wealthy and for business. Mr. Nelson quotes internally, "It is the largest transfer of wealth from labor to capital in our history," Senator DANIEL MOYNIHAN, Democrat, New York, said yesterday. We are using a 15 percent payroll tax, the combined burden on employer and employee, to pay the interest on Treasury bonds, which are generally not owned by blue-collar workers.

It is the working people. So when people say is there a difference in the parties, I say there is.

Mr. Speaker, I respect the position you have and other Members of the majority have. You are freely elected by your constituents. But I believe I also have the right and the obligation to point out, I believe, the position we are taking as Democrats is to defend the working people of this country and to defend their interests against great wealth. Great wealth can always take care of itself. Great wealth can take these bonds and get this interest.

What I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that these points be taken into account, and I hope that we will find ourselves dealing honestly with this budget. You will find in days to come, Mr. Speaker, that the plan that the President is putting forward, that is to say, the proposal, the elements of the proposal are going to be those that will be recognized by the American people as the basis for a fair conclusion to this budget debate.

Mark my words, the Speaker of the House will not be able to say, "Do it my way or no way at all." He will not be able to continue this, it is hard to characterize because I have never seen a legislative situation like this in my life in which the leader of a legislative institution sets an immutable standard

against which no one can dissent and that there is no room for discussion. I have never experienced that before, because you cannot do legislation that way.

So what the President is saying is that the agreement that was reached, and I think this is very, very important, the agreement that was reached on the balanced budget over the 7-year period, and, by the way, Mr. Speaker, parenthetically, this is closer to 8 or 9 years because we are halfway through this spending, not halfway through but by the time we get this budget reconciliation finished we will be halfway through the year.

So I submit to you, as I bring my remarks to a close, Mr. Speaker, my point would be this, that the proposal that the President has put forward is, and he is acting in good faith on that proposal because that proposal said that we would try to deal with 7 years, and as I indicated, it will be 8 years or longer, in effect, because we are already months into the fiscal year without an agreement, in the 1996 fiscal year without an agreement, and using the Congressional Budget Office figures or whatever they turn out to be, these are all guesstimates, and as I have already indicated, the Congressional Budget Office, at least when you ask them the right question, does not give you an answer which is not true; they have indicated that we are going off budget to balance this so-called budget, going into the Social Security funds.

It says we have to protect Medicare. We have to protect Medicaid. We have to protect our children. We have to protect those who grow our food.

Now, minus protecting these elements, Mr. Speaker, our health, the health of our people, the health of our elderly, the welfare of our elderly, the health and welfare of our children, education, nutrition, and those who grow our food, agriculture, and unless we protect those things, we are not going to have this balanced budget despite anybody's best effort at it.

So I submit to you that the President is acting in good faith. The President has a proposal on the table. The President understands negotiations. He has been a Governor. He has worked with legislatures before. He understands the executive-legislative relationship and the Governor, that is to say, Governor Clinton, who is now President Clinton, will be prepared, along with members of the Democratic Party, to take our proposal to protect people while at the same time reducing the deficit and try to structure from that a compromise which will lead to eventually a balanced budget.

I have no objection to the phrase. I have an objection to the illusion that it is going to be implemented in 7 years.

So I want to conclude, Mr. Speaker, at this stage by saying once again that I will be on this floor up to and through the time of the conclusion of the budget negotiations so that at least there

will be one voice on this floor and speaking out from this body, someone like my colleagues who are sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, taking as that obligation to speak the truth on the budget, something which is as fundamental as anything that there is that we do. All money measures come from the House of Representatives. We are the people's House, elected by the people. It is our responsibility and obligation to say that we are working with an honest budget, with honest numbers, and that if we are not and there is a continuation of this proposition that somehow the budget is being balanced by mortgaging the Social Security trust fund, that I speak out against it, and others speak out against it.

So I believe, by the time these negotiations are concluded, President Clinton will have put forward a series of proposals based on the proposition that there is give and take in every legislative activity and that if the Speaker is refusing to negotiate by simply setting down an immutable standard from which he will not deviate, that the American people will make their judgment known on election day in 1996 as to the efficacy of the Speaker's policy.

I believe that if we deal with the situation honestly, we can bring the deficit down, that eventually the budget can be brought into balance, we can salvage the Social Security trust fund rather than ravage that trust fund, and see to it that Medicare and Medicaid, the welfare of our children and the people who grow our food are protected and that we have a budget that we can honestly put forward to the American people as being in their best interests.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. TUCKER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ABERCROMBIE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. FALCOMA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BRYANT of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLAY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. LOWEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DIAZ-BALART) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes each day, today and December 7 and 8.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes each day, December 7 and 8.

Mr. LONGLEY, for 5 minutes each day, today and December 7, 8, 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. FUNDERBURK, for 5 minutes, December 7.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes each day, today and December 7.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. STUDDS.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. REED.

Mr. EVANS.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

Mr. TORRES.

Mr. KANJORSKI in two instances.

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

Mrs. FOWLER.

Mrs. WALDHOLTZ.

Mr. SHAW.

Mr. STUMP.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

Mr. CLINGER.

Mr. MARTINI.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

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

Mr. CRANE in two instances.

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. GEJDENSON.

Mr. BISHOP.

Mr. GOODLATTE.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. CLINGER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.