

there at the Pentagon. I will bump into him someday.

But this is what makes all of this uncomfortable: Mr. Speaker, Roosevelt was 35 years of age when he was Assistant Secretary of the Navy and we went to war in World War I. He could name every single ship of the line, and after him we had a run of five naval officers, four of them back to back, George Bush the last, and we had an artillery captain named Harry, like my dad, an artillery captain in World War I named Harry, then a five-star general during all of my years of active duty, then an Army Air Corps lieutenant who was also, like Roosevelt, 35. People say, "Why wasn't John Wayne in combat?" He was 35 when the war started, with three small children.

After this a long run of military people, I think of Roger Patterson, the trooper who told me to my face that Clinton said to him once driving around at night when they were out catting around; he said, "You know, Roger, why is it that the American people accept somebody to have worn the uniform or served? I don't think that is necessary." And his dream came true.

And now all the editorials are coming out saying of all people, of all people, to be in the commander in chief's job, to be sitting in the Oval Office, of all people to be there, it is this man who deliberately leaves Vietnam out of his speeches and who is going into what Churchill called the tinderbox of Europe, into the Sarajevo area.

Ironically our headquarters, our ground headquarters, will be in Tuzla. What is Tuzla? Tuzla is the last atrocity photographs on American television. On Friday, August 25, I met with the Japanese envoy, direct representative of Boutros Boutros-Ghali, Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Akashi. I have GREG LAUGHLIN and three military escorts as witnesses. I said, "Mr. Akashi, you are not qualified to pick military targets." "Oh, I picked good targets back in April."

I said, "You mean an outhouse with some ammunition in it? You must let General Ryan and his people, we just left him, we just left Admiral Layton; they say they are ready to use severe force if there is another atrocity."

This is Friday, the 25th; the bombing, the mortaring, of Tuzla was the 28th. I said, "I will do everything I can to get you removed from this position if you set yourself up as an armchair general under the U.N. chain of command, and you're going to pick out these meaningless targets. It's been 14 months since you unleashed the first strikes here. We never had but two ships elements ever go in here. We lost a British Harrier. It's been a miracle that we got Scott O'Grady back. Don't you pick the targets."

And I will close on this, Mr. Speaker. Monday the mortars hit the marketplace in Tuzla where we are setting up our headquarters and men are arriving

now. Bodies were blown in every direction, a man draped over a railing, children killed, people with their limbs, bones sticking out of their limbs. We are there, and I will close with what I told Clinton's team:

God bless you, good luck, we will be tracking the casualties, and may they be smart enough to hunker down for 11 months until we are out of there.

Clinton may posture as a winner on this case; we will beat him on domestic policy, on balancing the budget.

I will be back again next week with more special orders.

THE MINIMUM WAGE AND EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I will take 28 minutes and would like to yield the balance to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. Speaker, I think today is November 30. A continuing resolution has been passed which will take us to December 15. So, the countdown that I mentioned on Tuesday now moves forward. We have about 16 days left before the budget decision will be made. Hopefully there will not have to be another continuing resolution.

So the countdown continues, and tonight I would like to talk about two basic questions related to what is going on here as this budget process unfolds. The negotiations are taking place in various quarters, and we will expect probably next week to begin to see the outlines of some proposed negotiating positions by both the Democratic White House and the Republican-controlled Congress.

There are two basic questions I would like to ask tonight which relate directly—not so directly, but certainly indirectly, to the budget process that is going forward. One of these questions relates to the minimum-wage issue.

This morning we had a forum on the minimum wage. We called it a response to the 100 leading American economists, a congressional forum on minimum wages. One hundred and one leading American economists said more than a month ago that the American economy could not only benefit from a minimum-wage increase, but it was highly desirable, and we have not responded here adequately on Capitol Hill to that statement by the leading economists in the country.

We have a bill here, H.R. 940, sponsored by the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], which calls for an increase in the minimum wage in two steps; 45 cents an hour 1 year, and then a second year, another 45 cents, so a too-little 90-cent increase in the minimum wage would take place under the Gephardt bill.

The Gephardt bill has only 110 sponsors, only slightly more than the 101

economists, so there is a big question about why there is not more enthusiasm, on the one hand, among Democrats since we have 195 Democrats. I hope soon we will be joined by my good friend, Jesse Jackson, Jr., and there will be 196 Democrats, but the 195 Democrats are hesitating. Only 110 are on the minimum-wage bill; so there is a question there.

The President has endorsed the Gephardt minimum-wage bill. The President has endorsed the increase in the minimum wage to 90 cents over a 2-year period.

But there is a great opposition. First of all, there is not much enthusiasm among the whole Democratic Party, and then there is a great opposition among the Republicans, the majority Republicans refusing to even have a hearing on the minimum wage.

I am on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities which has direct responsibility for the minimum-wage law. I am the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee of Workforce Protections which has even more specific jurisdiction over the minimum-wage law, and we have not been able to get a hearing.

So we had an unofficial forum today to replace the kind of thing that would have happened at a hearing.

Why is there such great opposition? Why cannot we have at least a discussion of an increase in the minimum wage? Why does the majority leader of the Republican Party here in the House state that not only is he against any increase in the minimum wage, but he would like to see the minimum wage abolished altogether? He would like to see the law repealed. What does this have to do with balancing the budget? You know, what does it have to do with the Contract With America? The balancing of the budget will not be impacted in any significant way by an increase in the minimum wage.

You know, it is not—taxpayers do not pay workers; you know, the various enterprises where they are engaged, they pay the minimum wage. So why if there is a great concern about balancing the budget, why do we have to go off to the side and wage war against workers by saying that we will fight any increase in the minimum wage? Why? You know, it is a question that needs to be answered.

The other question I want to ask is also why do we have such tremendous cuts in the education budget? You know, I think that, you know, jobs and education are inextricably interwoven. That is why when I came to Congress I signed up for the Committee on Education and Labor, as it was called at that time, it was not the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, because you cannot separate the two. Education and the ability, the capacity, of people to qualify for jobs and to stay, to keep up with this fast-moving economy and the complexities of our present highly technological world, make education absolutely necessary

in order for people to be able to take advantage of jobs, and the employment question cannot be separated from the education question.

Today the Committee on Education funding has dubbed this day as Save Education Day, and they are battling to save education from \$4 billion in Federal cuts, \$4 billion, and the \$4 billion in Federal cuts have stimulated a wave of cuts across the country at the State level and the local level.

So why is education being cut? Why are we trying to abandon the public education system?

The polls show that the American people clearly favor education as a high priority for government expenditures at every level. The polls show this. They show it this year, and as a matter of fact right now the No. 1 priority, according to the taxpayers and the voters that we serve, the No. 1 priority is education. Education is ahead of health care, and health care is a great concern; but now education is the No. 1 priority.

So why are politicians refusing to read the polls? Why is there talk about a compromise at the White House where they are not going to insist that we not accept these \$4 billion in education cuts? Why was it placed on the chopping block in the first place?

After years of bipartisan support for Federal involvement in education and Federal support for education, all of a sudden education is placed on the chopping block, despite the fact that the American people say that is a priority we want to support. We want to support education.

□ 1815

So these are two basic questions. There is something happening here in this Capitol which is not related to balancing the budget. There is something else going on. In fact, balancing the budget becomes questionable when you look at these other activities.

Why is there war being waged against workers in terms of the OSHA, Occupational Safety and Health Agency? Why are we so determined to make the workplace less safe? Why is the Republican majority driving so hard to take away safeguards against accidents in the workplace? Why is there is war being declared on the Fair Labor Standards Act which determines what the hourly wages are going to be and also the conditions under which we set those wages in terms of overtime and various other provisions? Why is there an attack on that? Why is there an attack on the National Labor Relations Board? What does that have to do with balancing the budget?

Yes, it is true they have cut the budget, partially, of the National Labor Relations Board. It is such a tiny budget. The cuts clearly have nothing to do with trying to get more revenue out of the system in order to help balance the budget, the cuts are punitive. The cuts are designed to make the agency work less effectively.

So the war against labor has nothing to do with balancing the budget.

There is a class war going on here, maybe; I don't know. Every time you mention class war, the Republicans on the floor get very upset. "How dare you accuse us of waging a class war?" I am not accusing the Republicans of waging a class war; it is not a war, it is a massacre. When you have a war, you have contending parties of some kind of equal strength. What we have against the working people of America is a massacre. They are using their overwhelming power against the workers in every way.

Whether you are talking about OSHA and worker safety, fair labor standards or the National Labor Relations Board activities, or you are talking about minimum wage, there is a massacre going on directed against the American working people. It is not a class war, but certainly there is great contempt being shown for working people. There is great contempt being shown for the people at the very bottom in this society.

Yes, Wall Street now, the Dow Jones industrial average I think is up above 5,000. The boom is going on and on, great amounts of money are being made, executives are being paid the highest salaries ever. Everything is great for the management class, the ruling class, the elite that controls the House at this point. Why can there not be some generosity, some sense of sharing? Why can we not give a lousy 90-cent increase in the minimum-wage law? Why can we not have a 90-cent increase over a 2-year period?

The history for this minimum wage is that since 1938 we have had about six increases, and right now the last increase took place 6 years ago. That is when we last enacted legislation increasing the minimum wage. At that time the Senate majority leader, who is the leader of his party in both the House and Senate, and right across the country, he made a statement which I will quote.

Six years ago Senator DOLE said:

This is not an issue where we ought to be standing and holding up anybody's getting a 30 to 40 cents an hour pay increase at the same time that we are talking about capital gains. I never thought the Republican Party should stand for squeezing every last nickel from the minimum wage.

That is the end of the quote by Senator DOLE 6 years ago.

Apparently the Republican Party has changed their minds. Today it seems the Republican Party does stand for squeezing every last nickel and every last penny from the minimum wage. As I said before, the Republican majority leader of the House of Representatives has recommended that we repeal the minimum wage law completely, wiping it out. We are talking about pennies, 90 cents an hour, 45 cents this year and 45 cents next year. But beyond the money and the pennies at stake here is more than money. It is the work ethic itself.

When we permit the value of the minimum wage to erode, as we have in re-

cent years, we not only cause economic pain to working people, we do violence to the work ethic that we all profess to revere. Our words as elected officials exhort Americans to work hard, but our actions ridicule them by making work pay less and less year after year.

The value of the minimum wage is now at its second lowest level since the 1950's. It has lost nearly one-third of its value over the last decade. When Speaker GINGRICH graduated from high school in 1961, the real value of the minimum wage was \$5.41. That is \$1.16 cents more than it is today in value.

When Speaker GINGRICH completed higher education in 1971, the wage was worth \$5.67. That is a value of \$2.42 more than it is today. In 1978, the year Mr. GINGRICH was first elected to Congress, the wage was worth \$6 an hour, fully \$1.75 cents or more than 41 percent more than it is worth today.

We had some people testify who bring home this whole matter of how important this 90 cents per hour is. We had a gentleman who I would call a noble American worker, the best that we can offer, who testified today. I am proud to cite Mr. Donald Knight of Elizabeth, PA, who had to endure quite a bit of hardship to get to our hearing, our forum today.

I am going to read Mr. Knight's testimony in its entirety because I think it drives home the fact that we are not talking about something which is paltry. It may seem that 90 cents an hour does not mean much to a lot of people, but for the people out there making minimum wage, it means a great deal.

Mr. Donald Knight, I quote:

My name is Donald Knight. I am 61 years old. I live in Elizabeth, PA. My wife Barbara and I have raised three sons. Life in my area was good for as long as I can remember: Good jobs, and friendly communities. When your kids grew up, they got good jobs and you could depend on them in your old age. All of that changed in the 1980's. All of the good jobs in the steel mills and other manufacturing industries disappeared when the companies closed. For years there were almost no jobs, especially for someone like me in their fifties.

Now there are jobs, but they don't pay much and there are few benefits. We had an economic recovery, but it was a minimum wage recovery for us. Our kids, the ones that didn't leave the area for jobs somewhere else, they can hardly take care of their own families.

I started working in 1952 at a glass factory. In 1966 they closed down, and I went to work in a steel mill. From then until the 1980's I worked for U.S. Steel. We had layoffs and it wasn't always easy to support my family, but the mills always called us back to work. In 1982, U.S. Steel laid me off from the national tube mill, and when they closed that place in 1984 I knew things were going to be different. My unemployment checks ran out in 1984 and my wife and I were forced to swallow our pride and take welfare.

I cashed in my pension in 1987 to help us survive but that money went to bills and we were back on welfare soon after.

My wife and I took any jobs we could get. Some were under the table and all were temporary. We cleaned houses, got paid to walk other people's picket lines.

Then in 1990 I finally got a permanent job. It was for Allied Security as a guard. I

worked many different places, guarding other people's property. I even guarded a slag dump where they put the waste from steelmaking though I never understood why someone would want to steal the slag.

The only problem then was that I never made more than \$5.00 an hour and have had no health insurance for myself or my family. I have no pension and last made \$4.80 an hour for Allied Security after 5 years with the company.

My wife and I had bought a house and had it paid for by the time I lost my first good job. But over the last 10 years I haven't been able to take care of it. The water main broke and the water has been shut off for 3 years. The thermostat broke and we have had to use a kerosene heater for 2 years. Now my house has been condemned and all of the housing projects where we have tried to get into have waiting lists for at least a year.

My eyesight and hearing are getting bad and my wife has back problems but we can't afford to go to a doctor. They tell me I got clinically depressed when all the good jobs left my area but I never could find any place to go get help. When we absolutely have to, we go to the emergency room and somehow try to make payments on the bills. My wife and I were shocked to hear the Republicans here in Congress say that we don't need national health insurance because the current system is working fine. They say "let the private sector run things" but I can't find out who that is to go get the help I need. We guess they just don't know what it is like out where we live.

So working at about the minimum wage allowed us to survive, always falling further behind in our taxes and bills, but able to eat and buy kerosene. If a person makes a lot of money, the increase in the minimum wage proposed by President Clinton of 90 cents an hour might not seem like a lot. But to my family the additional couple thousand dollars a year would make a big difference. I probably couldn't pay all my debts but I would not be falling further behind all the time.

Just one final thing. Last week, just before Thanksgiving, I got fired from my job. After making my rounds I was sitting in my shanty and put my feet up on the table. Someone turned me in and said I must have been sleeping and the company fired me. I hope the Mon Valley Unemployed Committee can help me get unemployment checks and they told us about food stamps and medical assistance so I guess we will survive.

I only hope I can hang on until July next year when I can get Social Security. That and another minimum wage job will be the best standard of living Barb and I have had in more than 10 years. Lots of people, friends and family have helped us over these tough years but I always took pride in taking care of my family. A higher minimum wage would help me help myself.

That is the testimony of Mr. Donald Knight of Elizabeth, PA at our forum on minimum wage this morning.

There were other people who testified; a Mrs. Wong, a Mandarin garment worker from New York. Mrs. Wong spoke in Chinese and had to have an interpreter. Mrs. Wong told us that she would be happy to work for the present minimum wage, but the present minimum wage law is not being enforced in Chinatown in New York, so people are being forced to work below the minimum wage. She would like just to have greater enforcement of the minimum wage.

Why are we opposing a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage, which

would help these very poor people who are trying to help themselves?

I think perhaps most of the Members of Congress have lost contact with what real working people are all about and with what poverty is all about. They do not understand that an increase of 90 cents can make a great deal of difference. On the other hand, we are closing off the opportunity for the people who are forced to work at minimum wage to move beyond the level where they have to work at minimum wage. The only road out for people who are on poverty, in poverty now, is education. So I ask the second question.

In addition to us having a situation where the Republican majority opposes, adamantly opposes, an increase in the minimum wage, that same Republican majority is calling for great, deep cuts in education. Why are we cutting education when the American people have clearly said, "We don't want education cut, we would like an increase instead"?

Recently 71 percent of those polled say that President Clinton should reject a budget if it makes major cuts in Federal support for public education. Seventy-two percent said he should not accept any budget that cuts the student loan program and makes it harder for the middle class to afford college. This is reported by Peter D. Hart Associates, November 15, 1995.

Americans ranked education as the top legislative priority for Congress, 39 percent did, and improving education as the most important goal for the Federal budget, 35 percent. Lowering taxes and balancing the budget ranked last in the six choices.

This is an NBC News-Wall Street Journal poll taken September 16 and 19 of 1995. Ninety-two percent of all Americans believe that the Federal Government should spend the same or more on education, and 68 percent of those polled believe that the Government should spend more than current levels. Only 8 percent answered that the Government should spend less money on education. This was an NBC News and Wall Street Journal poll, again of January, 1995. Seventy-eight percent of Americans polled opposed cuts to Federal aid in education as a means of reducing the budget deficit. This is a New York Times poll and CBS News poll that was taken in December 1994.

Every time you take the polls and ask the question, education comes up clearly as a high priority. Why is the Republican majority insisting on cutting education so drastically? Where in the Contract With America is there a promise, a commitment to cut education?

There is something happening here which has nothing to do with balancing the budget. There is something happening here that has nothing to do with economics. There is something vicious happening here that needs to be looked at more closely. I enjoy watching the animal movies, the nature movies. I do not have any children, so I do not have

an excuse for watching them. I will have to confess, I like to watch them myself.

There is a particular animal movie about the competition between lions and hyenas, and maybe some of you have seen it, because it has been shown over and over again, a lot of reruns, and it is fascinating because what it says is that in the jungle, in the jungle, in nature, animals sometimes behave as irrationally as human beings.

We always thought, I was always raised to believe that the animal kingdom is pure. They only kill for food, when they need food. They do not get into revenge and hatred. But the competition between the hyena and the lion, the hyenas and the lions, it demonstrated that there was something else at work, something else was happening other than the battle for survival, other than the desire to survive from day to day, and the competition for food. They were not necessarily in competition for food. They fought each other like human beings fight each other in Yugoslavia and Rwanda. There is a kind of hatred there which makes them almost human, unfortunately.

The hyenas taunted the lions, and one hyena is murdered by a lion because he gets caught while he is taunting the lions, not trying to get food. The hyenas find a lioness out by herself and they murder her, not to eat her, but they murder her because they want revenge. There is an evil at work there. There is something that has not been figured out by the naturalists and the people who study animals in biology. There is something at work here in Washington that we have not quite put our hands on also. It has nothing to do with saving money. It has nothing to do with streamlining the budget. It is something else. There is a contempt, a hatred for working people, a desire to wipe out a segment of the population.

A lot of the budget cuts are not designed to save money, they are designed to destroy programs. They are not designed to reform, they are designed to wreck. There is a mentality that the elite minority deserves to have an America that belongs just to that elite minority. Otherwise, how do you justify the intense opposition against an increase in the minimum wage? How do you justify the Republican majority fighting a 90-cent increase in the minimum wage?

□ 1830

How do you justify the Republican majority waging war on education programs, cutting education when our future is clearly wrapped up in our educational advances and the possibility that we will be able to survive in the future will depend on the degree of education that we have? That is pretty much understood. National security is very much interwoven with our ability to educate the population and to stay ahead of the tremendous unfolding of more and more complex knowledge all the time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to have the best educated, the most educated population possible. The rhetoric clearly understands this. Speeches that have been made by Republican presidents, started by Ronald Reagan and then continued by George Bush, have always said that America is at risk, that we are a nation at risk if we do not provide proper education, and yet the Republican majority has undertaken budget cuts that are devastating. If enacted, this will be the largest setback in education in our history. They will be cut by 17 percent, while overall spending is only being cut by 4 percent.

We need to come to grips with why is this being done by the Republican majority. The proposal would deny millions of America's children, youths and adults precious opportunities for education. They would slash funding for basic and advanced skills.

The bills would deny access to college by eliminating student aid Pell grants for 280,000 students. The budget bill would jeopardize the education of children with disabilities by shifting some \$1 billion in Medicaid costs for health-related services for more than 1 million children with disabilities to the States.

The legislation would eliminate help for safe and drug-free schools, eliminate most of the program that exists throughout the school system all over the Nation. The legislation would halt progress on school reform and innovation. The cuts would deny access to Head Start for 180,000 children in the year 2002, compared to the present 1995 enrollment in Head Start.

These are devastating cuts, the combination of the two. Why do we have the assault on the minimum wage, the assault on workers in every way, minimum wage, safety, Fair Labor Standards Act? Why do we have these cuts in education which would allow the poor to help themselves, allow the poor to get into the mainstream and be able to become part of the great middle class?

America has built a middle class over the years through education, something called the GI bill of rights which helped hundreds of thousands all in one program. Then we had aid to higher education that existed long before we had aid to any other form of education.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to close at this point and yield to my colleague, but the question here I want to end with is, what is it at work here in Washington that goes beyond a concern with balancing the budget? What is at work here that goes beyond a desire to streamline government?

There is a desire by an elite minority to wipe out a certain segment of the population. A massacre has been organized against the defenseless people at the lowest rungs in our society, and that has to be examined closely if we are to understand where we are going in the next 16 days.

In the next 16 days, the people out there who have let it be known through the polls that they support education, in the next 16 days the people out there who have overwhelmingly supported an

increase in the minimum wage, they have to let it be known that they are watching; and their common sense should prevail over the kind of strange behavior that is predominant here among the Republican majority who control the House of Representatives.

THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET IS A CHARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for 33 minutes.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for yielding to me.

The point that the gentleman was making and has been making so clearly about the minimum wage and the necessity for having a living wage in order to be able to sustain one's self in today's world is more than amply demonstrated if we consider the budget negotiations now underway.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that I have appeared on the floor on this subject, but obviously you and other colleagues and other citizens, friends tuning in to our proceedings, may not have heard everything it is that is at stake. You see and hear the headlines about balancing the budget, but Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you today, and I am not the only one, that that is not what is taking place.

The budget is not being balanced. I feel very, very strongly that every time the national media in particular, whether linear or in newspapers or electronic with radio and television, report the balanced budget negotiations going on, they are doing a disservice. I do not want to say it is a question of lazy journalism. It may simply be the fact that not sufficient homework is being done or that we have moved into a situation in which news is reported simply on the basis of what is said by one side and another on an action-reaction basis, and then no one bothers to research any more as to whether anything anybody says is true or not.

Mr. Speaker, let me put forward to you the simple proposition that I am contending is the actual situation with the nonbalancing of the budget. I do not know if we want to call it a truth-in-budgeting proposition, but we most certainly do not have a balanced budget. Very simply, very plainly, I want to state, and so far there has been no repudiation of this whatsoever by anyone in the majority, that there is in fact no balanced budget, that the budget that is printed has been available to us right straight through from the beginning from the majority, does not contain a balancing by the year 2002.

I can understand why the Speaker of the House said that he arrived, or is reported to have said that he arrived at the 7-year number by intuition. I can understand that, because it is all guesswork. The No. 7, the 7 years, 2002, is something that was picked out of the

air because they were able to balance the budget on paper, but on paper only. It is a charade. It is an illusion.

What is happening, Mr. Speaker, is as follows: Every year, including this year, there is going to be a deficit, and the deficit will be here this year to the tune of some \$245 billion; and the deficit in the year 2002 will be in the neighborhood of \$105 to \$108 billion, all assuming that there are no bumps in the economic road. In order to mask, in order to mask those deficits put forward by the Republican majority, put forward by the Speaker of the House, they are going to take from the Social Security trust fund billions upon billions upon billions of dollars, starting in the neighborhood of \$63 billion this year and billions upon billions every year thereafter, up until the year 2002, in which they will take approximately \$115 billion.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that if the deficit in the year 2002 is approximately \$105 billion and you borrow \$115 billion, you can claim on paper that you have a \$10 billion surplus.

So I am stating yet once again today—and I hope the proposition will attract some interest at some point—that the negotiations now going on between the White House and the Republican majority are not geared toward balancing the budget. No one who examines this budget can come to that conclusion.

Now it is going to be said that it is balanced, but it is not. Because on the day that the budget is supposed to be balanced, we will need an explanation from Mr. GINGRICH as to how we are to pay the approximately \$636 billion that has been taken from the Social Security Trust Fund, plus interest.

My calculations and those of Senator HOLLINGS and Senator DORGAN in the other body indicate that that will probably be in the neighborhood of \$1 trillion owed to the Social Security trust fund by the people who say they are balancing the budget.

Now I have been a single voice so far, at least on the floor of this House, trying to bring out what the truth of all of these budget negotiation shams are all about. But I can assure you I am not the only one and will not be the only one by the time this process is over. I am going to continue to speak out; I am going to continue to bring to this floor the quotations from columns and observations by others who are beginning to catch on to what this is all about.

Does anybody out there, do any of our colleagues really believe that if it was possible to balance the budget in 7 years that it would not have been done already? In time to come I will show how this kind of proposition has been put forward before. President Reagan said he was going to do it. President Bush said he was going to do it. President Clinton indicated he would certainly like to do it.