

goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I keep hearing about CBO and OMB, and they are all projections. No one for a certainty can say what the accurate final result would be. But I would like to inject into the discussion the name of Sister Rosa. He tells the future by reading cards. I think she could do better than OMB and CBO.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his suggestion.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, she is a lady that does that back in my district.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I think that maybe Sister Rosa do a better job than CBO or OMB. But the fact remains that the President did not agree in a piece of legislation that he signed into law to take the projections of Sister Rosa. He did not agree to take the projections of the OMB. He agreed to use the projections of the CBO, and then yesterday he acts as though it is a completely novel idea and he says: Gosh, maybe it will be possible to reach that goal. I think maybe we will do that. This is something new. I had not thought about that. I think we can put it all together.

Well, for heaven's sakes, Mr. Speaker, that is what he agreed to 29 years ago. It seems to me that what is really going on here is a stalling tactic. It is an amazing thing. The President thinks that for his own political good that he will do better by putting this off longer and longer and longer and longer.

We see the same thing going on right now with respect to the subpoena on the Whitewater papers in the Committee on the Judiciary or the Whitewater committee over in the Senate. What the President has done is that he has said: I am invoking an attorney-client privilege. He knows there is no good attorney-client privilege on this matter, but he has invoked the attorney-client privilege, knowing that he will spin that one through.

Mr. Speaker, that will take some time, and then he will go to an Executive privilege that he will call up and ask to spin that one through, all the while, delaying, delaying, delaying.

The President seems to think that time is on his side, but the fact is that he did agree to and we will insist on and we will come up with a balanced budget using honest numbers.

#### BUDGET IMPASSE REQUIRES COMPROMISE

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

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DE LA GARZA.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding brief-

ly to me. The previous speaker, I guess, inadvertently mentioned that the President said that 29 years ago, and he meant 29 days. But the one that introduced a balanced budget amendment 31 years ago was this gentleman from Texas. So it is not new. Everyone is climbing on board now. I did it 31 years ago.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA] should be commended for that. We appreciate it and we appreciate his support working for a balanced budget now. But the fact remains, we have got this agreement and the President should honor his word. That is all we are saying.

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to bring Sister Rosa into the picture. She has got better figures than OMB and CBO.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I enjoy the fact that we can sit here particularly with the Members of the freshman and sophomore class, and participate in this open discussion. It is worthwhile for those individuals across America who may be bored with Christmas shopping and watching C-SPAN, or perhaps going through some therapy that they are undergoing trying to understand what is going on down here in the asylum.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that probably for the first time in the history of the United States, we have extreme polarization of positions on the passage of the budget. A lot of people who are not necessarily informed with the process may think that we are indeed insane, or that what the House of Representatives of the Congress or the entire Federal Government is going through right now is a form of insanity, but in reality we all know that it is a very serious thing and it has to do with very honest and real differences of my friends on the Republican side and our side.

Mr. Speaker, if I could just address for a few moments what those differences are and maybe encourage some of my friends on the other side to talk about it.

Mr. Speaker, the previous speaker talked about some contract. Having been a lawyer, particularly having dealt with Philadelphia lawyers, although not claiming to be a Philadelphia lawyer myself, there is a great deal of respect paid to contracts; that supposedly any time we have a contract, that says something that in reality will take place in accordance with the word of the contract, or that that has some superforce above and beyond anything else.

Well, there are several ways to interpret contracts and I think we have to accept that as a given. Very clearly in the situation of the President and whatever contract is interpreted by the majority party of the House, there is a definitely wide distinction as to how they interpret the meaning of what was agreed to some 29 days ago.

Second, just because we have the Contract for America, or on America, I

am never sure, but just because we have that, that does not pass the value of the Constitution and how we interpret that, nor does it pass good sense for what we do this year, next year, for the next 7 years of this Republic, and for as long as this Republic endures under this Constitution.

The one certainly that we have is that government in a democracy is very expensive; it takes a great deal of time; it is very inefficient, because there is the necessity that if 250 million people are to exist in this world with different thoughts and philosophies, different political positions, different social positions, and coming from different cultural backgrounds, it takes a requirement of that ugly word which some of my younger friends on the other side of the aisle seem to find a great deal of distaste for and that is the word called "compromise."

I have heard the Speaker talk much earlier, I think maybe as long as 6 months ago, that with the new revolution that occurred in the House of Representatives, that there would be cooperation but not compromise. If my colleagues have extreme views, I do not know how we get to a final solution without compromise.

Mr. Speaker, let me talk about what those extreme views are. We can all write a budget that will balance in 7 years, which is a projection of time with no certainty, all dependent on variables that are so complicated and uncertain in their nature that at best it is a guesstimation. We could arrive at a balanced budget in 7 years under the numbers scored by the CBO, the Office of Management and Budget, Morgan and Stanley, the Harvard Business School, the Wharton School, we could find any number of people who would be willing to score it and we could agree that it should be CBO.

#### FEDERAL WORKERS UNFAIRLY BURDENED BY BUDGET IMPASSE

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 would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KANJORSKI] to finish his point.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, our point is that we could all come up with this type of budget. We could have 435 different budgets taking into consideration various conditions. Right now we have what is called the coalition budget that has no tax cut in it and that does balance the budget, so clearly the Democratic side or the President could put that budget on the table or some various of that, which the Senate seems to have put together on their side.

It requires, however, a decision as to whether or not we are going to have a tax cut, a smaller proportional tax cut,