Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I wanted you to know, it is not totally perfected yet. It is a continuing resolution. My understanding is it will go to March 15. It takes those appropriation bills the President has vetoed. It reinstates some of that funding to give the President another chance to keep Government open. It takes targeted legislation at appropriations that are going to extend all the way through the rest of this fiscal year.

Mr. VOLKMER. Do you know the ones that are being targeted and the ones that are not being targeted?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I think the argument is still going on, including Democrats in that argument, but the fact is, no, I do not know the final resolution of that bill.

Mr. VOLKMER. None of us know.

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

Mr. VOLKMER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and I have been to quite a few meetings. When were these appropriations bills due?

Mr. VOLKMER. They were due to be done by September 30. We all know that. The American public does not know. They think that we as Democrats have had something to do with the closing of the Federal Government. We do not have anything to do with it. We cannot write the legislation. We cannot bring the legislation. It is only those Republican members who can do it.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, there was a rumor out earlier today, they seem to persist around here, that they were on the 30th resolution of this CR and had not come up with one that is acceptable even for the Republican Party.

Mr. VOLKMER. The 30th draft.

Mr. HEFNER. Hopefully we will get there when we get to——

Mr. VOLKMER. I would just like to mention one other thing, folks, that is going on here that they are planning to do, this great majority that is running this Congress. They cannot get a dang thing done. I could use a harder word but it is not permissible on the House floor.

They did not do anything the first session. You can look at the total bills that they passed. It is the worst record since 1933. Do you know what these, I do not know what you call them, people are proposing to do today? They are going to finally bring in something here that asks us to vote for it, which we have never seen, and then they are going to say, OK, bye-bye, we are going.

They are going to send it to the Senate. They do not know what the Senate is going to do with it. And if the Senate does not pass it that way, because it has to be done that way, you cannot change one t in it, one i in it, one period in it. If they do not take it, then the Government closes down. They are not going to stay here to wait and see if they can work something out with the Senate. No, they want to leave here. Get out of here.

I say stay here, stay here until we make sure that the Senate does it. And if the Senate does not do it, we work it out with the Senate. And then after it is all worked out and we know if it takes until tomorrow we know then that the Federal Government is going to continue to operate, then we do it.

But the way you are proposing to do it, you are saying to the Senate, take it or leave it. I do not think the Senate is going to do that.

BUDGET IMPASSE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I also say, let us stay here, let us resolve the issue. It seems to me that again we need a review of what is happening with this budget process.

The Democrats criticize the Republicans for probably biting off more than they can chew in terms of spending cuts. As it turned out, those Democrats were probably right. We had a lot of ideas that we wanted to accomplish to bring spending under control. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to the American citizens, wake up, America.

Anybody under 50 years old better start putting in some studying time on what is happening to this Federal budget, what is happening to overspending, overtaxing and overborrowing, because it is going to affect your lives. It is going to affect your kids' lives. We have now mounted a huge Federal debt of $4.9 trillion, plus the extra $100 billion that Secretary Rubin has creatively come up with that is no less an obligation of this country to pay back.

We are looking at a situation now where we have made such huge promises in social programs that we cannot afford to pay for them. Civil service retirement has an unfunded liability or a so-called actuary debt of a half a trillion dollars; Medicare, $5 trillion actuary debt; Social Security, $3.2 trillion actuary debt.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

□ 1230

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to be argumentative. I will not speak about the CR as such. I want to speak just a minute about the debt limit. I would like to make a point. The gentleman is a man of real intelligence and very well respected here.

On the extension of the debt limit, absolutely we have no choices, it has to be done. We have spent the money in my district, in your district, in 435 districts around this country. Every Member of this Congress has something in his district that calls for Federal funds. We have to do that. Why are we making such a production and tying this up? Because it has to be done. It is just like death and taxes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, it is a moral obligation to pay the bills we owe. Why it is reasonable to attach the debt limit to the consideration of an overhaul of spending is because Congress has lost its control over spending for 50 percent of what this Government spends. those are now on automatic pilot in the so-called welfare and entitlement programs. Those programs are the biggest reason that we need additional debt limit in the future. So it is reasonable to tie these two together.

I mentioned earlier today, Mr. Speaker, in a 1-minute, all of the previous debt limit extensions forcing Presidents to do things that they did not otherwise want to do by increasing taxes. The most recent, of course, was the 1993 bill, where we had the largest tax increase in history, but also George Bush in 1990, where the large tax increase was tied to that debt limit extension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHRYSLER].

Mr. CHRYSLER. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the point, the question is really this: Mr. President, why did you not submit the balanced budget that you submitted on January 6 on December 15, and then the Federal Government would not have been shut down? It was available to them since last July, because it was the budget of Senator DASCHLE. We would have been able to keep the Government employees working and we would have kept the Government going.

So whose fault is it that this Government shutdown happened? Clearly, the President could have submitted that budget. Clearly, he could have kept the Government running. Most importantly, he could have kept his word to the American people.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is absolutely correct. The eastern media do not say it, but it takes two to tango. We need to bring both sides to this table. If we are serious about a balanced budget, we can do it. The fact is that it is much easier to say you want a balanced budget than to come up with the spending cuts to do it. It is too easy for the other side to demagog every spending cut, to go to that interest group and say, Look at these mean-spirited Republicans and what they are doing to you.

Mr. Speaker, we have overcommitted ourselves. We are no longer the rich Nation we were. If people under 50 years old want anything left in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, the kinds of programs that we should be

running, it is important that we start being reasonable. We not only reduce spending and stop deficit overspending, but we start paying back some of that huge, huge debt that we already owe.

Mr. CHRYSLER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, we have put forth a bipartisan budget. Every budget that we have submitted in this Congress has had bipartisan support, where the President, who has now submitted five budgets, has yet to receive the first Democrat and/or Republican and/or independent vote for any of the budgets that he has supported.

So, certainly, we have a good, strong bipartisan effort, and I think that is what we are going to see come to the floor in the next few weeks, and the President has yet to get his first vote for anything.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There are two numbers that I think the American people and all of us should remember about the President's budget. One number is $300 billion, one number is $200 billion. He spends $300 billion more than Republicans. He increases or has higher taxes, $200 billion more, than the Republican proposal.

CUTTING BUDGET DEFICITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to set the record straight here, talking about all the budgets the President has submitted. If you want to be honest about this thing, in all honesty, the budget you people offered there was not the President's budget. You made a big to-do about it. You took some numbers out of some statements that were made. It was not a budget that was offered by the President of the United States. That is totally wrong.

Mr. Speaker, when you wanted to rewrite history, you offered a budget. The budget passed. The President vetoed it. You went into deliberations with the President of the United States. You said, ''We will not talk anymore until the President offers a balanced budget scored by CBO.'' That was the big argument in this House and in the Senate and across this country, scored by CBO.

The President came up with a budget that was scored by CBO. It was not to your liking, so you said, ''No, that is not good enough. You have to move closer to where we want to go. And if you do not, if you do not accept our deal, there will be no deal and we will shut the Government down.''

Let us not rewrite history here in these 5-minute speeches. The President in good faith offered a 7-year budget scored by CBO. The President stood in this well on his State of the Union Address and said, ''We have got enough cuts to balance the budget in 7 years.'' Why do you not agree to take these cuts and balance the budget, and then we will talk about these philosophical arguments later?

You mention Medicare, you mention Social Security, you mention Medicaid. When you start talking about these programs, gentlemen, I hate to say it, but you do not have any credibility. You opposed all of these programs since their inception. You opposed Social Security, you opposed Medicare, and one of the candidates for President of the United States, our dear Senator from the other body said, ''Thirty-five years ago I stood and said it would not work. I fought Medicare.'' Your Speaker of this House said, ''It is going to die on the vine. Medicare, we hope it dies on the vine.'' Your majority leader said, ''Social Security should never have been established.'' So your record ain't good on these programs.

If you want to talk about philosophy and these things, we can talk about that, but there is a proposal that the President of the United States has offered that balances the budget in 7 years, and it is scored by CBO.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

My good friend from Michigan is a wonderful Member, and I am very fond of him. But his memory is short; it tends to be a little on the convenient side. The gentleman has forgotten where this big debt came from.

When Jimmy Carter left office and Ronald Reagan came in, the national debt of the United States was $700 billion. With Reagan's first budget, the so-called Gramm-Latta budget, Democrats over here warned that the practical consequences of that was going to be that it was going to enormously increase the debt because it immensely increased military expenditures, cut expenses in other programs slightly, and gave a massive tax cut to the well-to-do.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of that, the national debt by the time that Mr. Reagan left office went from $700 billion to $4.5 trillion. It multiplied somewhere between 5 and 7 times.

My Republican colleagues, in talking about debt, deficits, and fiscal irresponsibility, forget the fact that it was their budget. They also forget the fact that the Democrats during that period of time who controlled the House cut, cut the Reagan budgets by $49 billion, and they reapportioned the money so we spent less on defense and we spent more on environment, on health, on senior citizens, on education, and on things that are really important to the long life of this country.

I want to tell my good friend something else. He is complaining about the entitlement programs. The Republicans on this side of the aisle came up with a great idea, that cost-of-living should be included in Social Security. Up until that time, the Congress always raised Social Security payments and adjusted the income and the outgo so that the two figures would be roughly in balance, and so that the fund would remain safe and secure and solvent. There was a congressionally managed program, which we managed very carefully.

My Republican colleagues did not like voting on that, and they figured that the best way they could get out of casting that vote was to then tie it to the cost-of-living, so that is how Social Security began to get out of balance, because my Republican colleagues came up with a splendid idea that Social Security should become essentially a pay-as-you-go, rather than a trust fund program. That is why we have that program to address today. That is why the budget is in such a mess.

AMENDING TITLE XI, D.C. CODE

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

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to speak today on a bill that we have introduced, H.R. 1855. This is a bill that amends the District of Columbia Code, title XI of the D.C. Code, but basically what it does is it allows Dr. Elizabeth Morgan and her daughter Ellen to return to the United States.

This bill is the product of my own deepest feelings and knowledge, and as a society, we are far more sensitive to the pain that children can feel than we were when I was coming of age. Legislative bodies across the land at every level have recognized the importance of listening more carefully to what children say, and the laws that we now pass arise from an enormous and growing body of evidence that in many cases of domestic stress and conflict, it is too easy to lose sight of who is being harmed.

Commonsense actions to slice through the Gordian knot of pride and anger can often prevent permanent emotional damage and allow wounds to heal as quickly and completely as possible. That is what H.R. 1855 attempts to do. That is all H.R. 1855 intends to do.

Domestic conflict and stress can take many forms. Its victims are too often unintended and innocent. As a local jurist has said in connection with the very situation that gives rise to this bill, when elephants fight, the grass suffers, so I believe that I would not be true to the great lessons I have learned in life were I to just take the easy way out when confronted with a difficult situation involving a child's life.

Yes, it would be easy for me to ignore Ellen Morgan, a soon-to-be 13-year-old American child who is afraid to come back to our country, our country, unless this bill is passed. It might be easy for us to ignore Ellen Morgan, to wash our hands of her unusual and tragic situation, but I believe that would be