United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1996 No. 2

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. LAHOOD].

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 4, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable RAY LAHOOD to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are thankful, O gracious God, for all the wonderful gifts that have come from Your hand that You have given to us and to every person. Remind us that Your blessings and countenance are not only on us personally, but bless Your people from every background or position or opinion. So we pray, almighty God, that we will be gracious of others, hear their words, respect their concerns, and always realize that Your grace is with each person in Your whole creation. May Your loving spirit, O God, that is new every morning, be with us this day and every day, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEFLEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that there will be fifteen 1-minutes on each side.

BALANCING THE BUDGET: WHAT'S IT ALL ABOUT?

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, balancing the budget: What is it all about? Balancing the Federal budget is about better government. It is about being right and responsible. It forces the Government to live within its means—just like every American family. It means our children will inherit the American dream—not the American debt. It forces our Government to stop spending money it does not have.

Balancing the budget is also about a better future. It means lower interest rates and faster economic growth. It means 4.25 million more new jobs over the next 10 years and a 16.1-percent increase in per capita incomes. A balanced budget is about $37,000 in savings on an average 30-year mortgage on a $75,000 home. It means a solvent Medicare system with increased spending per beneficiary. But probably most important of all, a balanced budget is about saving future generations from paying lifetime tax rates in excess of 80 percent.

Mr. Clinton needs to know we will settle for nothing less than a balanced budget. No more excuses. No more Washington gimmicks. It is time to do the right thing for our children's future.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, this is day 20 of the Government shutdown and it is beginning to bite. Not simply Federal employees but small business people who cannot get export licenses, other business people who want permits so they can put toxic waste aside and cannot and are closing down their businesses. Social Security recipients who want to sign up for Social Security the first time who cannot.

It is affecting average Americans. Now we hear the most Orwellian of doublespeak from the other side. They blame President Clinton for this because of vetoing some bills that they do not like.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

Well, Presidents have vetoed bills throughout history, Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson, and Roosevelt. But what is different this time is not that the President vetoes bills but that this is the first Congress and only one House of this Congress because Senator DOLE is not going along that says, if the President does not sign every bill we pass, we are shutting down the Government. That is a disgrace. It is a disgrace to all Americans, particularly those affected by this horrible shutdown.

SPEAKING OF DOUBLESPEAK

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, speaking of Orwellian doublespeak, to hear my friends from New York talk about Washington and Jefferson and Lincoln and mention the current occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue in the same breath is truly astounding.

My colleagues, once you get past the politics of victimization, the debate is about this: Why is $12 trillion over the next 7 years not enough? Why should the children being born today pay over $185,000 in interest on the debt if we fail to act? My friend from New York indicts this majority in Congress because he would rather go back to business as usual, to the 40 years that gave us this mind-boggling debt, to just continuing on with spend and spend and tax and spend some more.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve better. I am proud to stand up for the people.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN, DAY 20

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, today is day 20 of the Government shutdown. The fault lies entirely with the House Republican leadership.

Yesterday there was an opportunity or there would have been an opportunity because the Senate sent over a continuing resolution to allow the Government to operate once again. But Speaker GINGRICH and the House Republican leadership would not bring the resolution up. There are 198 Democrats on our side that are prepared to vote to keep the Government operating. We only need 20 Republicans in order to accomplish the goal of reaching 218 and opening up this Government again.

My understanding is that in the House Republican conference there are enough votes to do that. But the Speaker, Speaker GINGRICH, and the House Republican leadership will not allow a vote to come to the floor. Instead, we understand today they want to bring up a resolution that would allow them to recess this House for 2 or 3 weeks until January 23 and the Government would be shut down that entire time. I say no to that motion to recess. Let us stay here and let us get this Government going again.

REPUBLICANS DO NOT HOLD THE KEYS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, the President seems to think that House Republicans are keeping the Government shut down. I must say, as a House Republican that is news to me.

You see the Government's front door has got a big old deadbolt on it. Republicans managed to open the door when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. President Clinton slammed the door shut and locked it tight when he vetoed the Balanced Budget Act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is my keychain. None of my keys will open the Government. I checked around with some of my colleagues. None of their keys will open the Government either. As it turns out, when the President vetoed the Balanced Budget Act, he did not just shut the door, he changed the lock.

Mr. Speaker, we do not hold the keys. The President does. There is only one way the Government is going to open back up, and that is when the President of the United States agrees to a plan that balances the budget in 7 years and uses honest numbers.

KUWAIT AND CHINA

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in 1991, America went to war. America went to the front lines to free Kuwait from Iraqi occupation. America spent over $75 billion. American troops died in the gulf. American troops still suffer from that war disease.

After all that, ladies and gentlemen, let us talk some business. Kuwait just awarded China, that is right, China, a $391 million contract to build two oil gathering projects. Now, if that is not enough to change the oil filter, folks, Kuwait did not even consider American bids. Think about it. After good old Uncle Sam saved their assets, put our young people's lives on the lines, quoting news reports, Kuwait did not even consider American bids. Beam me up. With a foreign policy like this, it is a wonder we have any budget to balance.

TRAVELGATE

(Mr. CHABOT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, for 2 long years, Mr. Speaker, a career public servant has been targeted, smeared, and ultimately prosecuted, all the news suggested, as part of a political coverup designed to justify the Travelgate firings and the transfer of White House business to political cronies. Thank God for the jury system which acquitted Billy Dale in just 2 hours. But chilling facts continue to emerge.

Today the AP reports a newly released memo in which a high administration official explained the origins of this Orwellian case by saying, and I quote, ''We knew that there would be hell to pay if we failed to take swift and decisive action in conformity with the First Lady's wishes.'' That is shocking, and I will tell my colleagues, regardless of how powerful the person who ordered it, no matter how high in the Clinton administration, if Federal law enforcement agencies were turned against a career public servant as part of a political coverup, there ought to be, and I quote, ''hell to pay'' on the part of all those responsible.

REPUBLICAN GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Republicans, this is your Government shutdown, and it is now item No. 11 of the Contract With America. It is your baby and you are going to have to defend it. Good luck.

It is unconscionable to go again on recess without reopening the Government. What you are forgetting is that you are not just hurting Federal employees. You are hurting average Americans, small businesses. Do not hide behind the balanced budget rhetoric. Who is President Clinton expected to negotiate with? Senator DOLE, who is being shellacked already by the right wing? Senate Republicans who appear to be responsible? Or GINGRICH and House Republicans who want a hard line?

Mr. Speaker, we cannot negotiate with five Republican parties. Republicans, get your act together. This institution is not looking good these days. We are all going to have to suffer unless we get these games stopped.

GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE REOPENED

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a resolution to allow the Congress to recess until January 23. I personally think we should reopen the Government, but under no circumstances should the Congress leave town while the Government is shut down. The soldiers in Bosnia are not leaving Bosnia.

And do not clap, because I do not agree with you on the other side of the

aisle, too. You all have been partisan and politicizing this place.

The soldiers in Bosnia are not leaving. The cancer researchers are not leaving. The FBI agents are not leaving. I personally believe, and we all only answer to our constituents and to our conscience, but I believe it would disgrace the Congress for us to leave while the Government is shut down.

One other thing to my side, this is not a leadership vote. This is a conscience vote. And my conscience is not for sale. Congress should not leave while the Government is shut down.

You all ought to stop being so partisan, because when we can get together in the spirit of reconciliation, we can solve these problems. Each side eggs the other side on and nothing gets done.

TAX DOLLARS NOT AT WORK

(Mr. WYNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, at the State and local level, when you pass a roadway, there is a big sign that says your tax dollars at work. Here in Washington we ought to have a sign that says, your tax dollars are not at work. Because that is the reality in day 20 of the Government shutdown. Let us be real. The Republicans are trying to say this is President Clinton's shutdown. Absolutely wrong. The President could not open the Government if he wants to.

The Republicans set the agenda. The Republicans are in the majority. The Republicans have the vote. Let there be no mistake. This is a Republican, a Gingrich Republican government shutdown.

This is not about a balanced budget in 7 years with real numbers. I am for that. A lot of Democrats are for that. There are budgets out there to do this. This is about their desire to give tax breaks to the wealthy while cutting Medicare and Medicaid.

Meanwhile our employees, the taxpayers' employees and their families are suffering. Mortgage payments are not being made. Utility bills are not being met. Car payments are not being made. Clothes for the kids are not being met, and contractors are not being paid. I hope Federal employees will come to Washington, to Capitol Hill to share their pain with these Republican revolutionaries.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT US TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I am a House Republican freshman. The President calls me an extremist, right-wing, radical Republican freshman.

What am I so extremist about? Well, I want the Government to balance its budget, just like my family has to. A balanced budget means lower interest rates, which means cheaper car loans, mortgages, and student loans. Pretty scary stuff.

I want to cut taxes for working families and I want to reduce capital gains tax to create more jobs. Yes, I know it will mean more take home pay for working Americans and better jobs. Well, I guess that is extreme if my colleagues are big government liberals.

I have been in Washington for an entire year, and am still being overcome by commonsense, practical, and honest solutions to our Nation's problems. I guess in Washington that is pretty extreme. Mr. Speaker, the American people expect us to balance the budget and do the right thing for our children's future.

WE HAVE OUR PAY SO WE ARE GOING TO GO PLAY?

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard excuse, after excuse, after excuse. Let us put the record straight. Let us look at facts, not rhetoric.

Yesterday we had on this floor the potential of bringing up what the House should have brought up, and that was the resolution, passed unanimously in the U.S. Senate because the Senate, with BOB DOLE, said enough is enough. Of course it is. Today the taxpayers will spend another $40 million for nothing, for nothing because they are going to keep this shutdown as we watch Head Start going into trouble, as we watch 240 small businesses a day not be able to get capital loans to keep going, and on, and on, and on.

What are the Gingrich Republicans in the House saying? They get the Marie Antoinette compassion award. They are saying, ''Let them eat cake. We have our pay.''

So, today we are going to vote a recess resolution. We are going to go play.

Now I think the American people are very angry if they say, ''We have our pay, we're going to go play.''

We cannot open it with keys. We open it with a voting card. They keep voting ''no.'' That is what is wrong.

I AM HERE TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago the 1st day of the 104th Congress began. In short it was the beginning of the end. It was the beginning of the end for the Washington business-as-usual crowd, and when the balanced budget is signed into law, the American people will understand why they held the second Boston tea party here in Washington on November 1994.

Oh, in the past, yes, our leaders in Washington have always backed down from making tough decisions necessary to lead this country, and they always found a way to protect their spending while adding new taxes and new debt to the American people. As a result we have a $5 trillion debt. We spend $200 billion a year on interest just to keep that debt alive.

That is what these folks are really for. Mr. Speaker, the new majority is here to say no. The President said the House Republicans are unwilling to compromise. Well, I want to tell my colleagues I am here to balance the budget, and I believe that we have compromised for 26 years. We have added the spending. We have compromised the business of big Government. We are not going to do it anymore.

JOIN THE SENATE AND PASS A CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, 480,000 Federal employees are working without pay, a form of involuntary servitude; 280,000 Federal employees are not working, and they will be paid. Virtually all of these workers have mortgages to pay, children to feed, and financial obligations to meet.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening to these workers is immoral, is wrong, and must be rectified immediately. NEWT GINGRICH and the Republican leadership must not continue to hold the House and the American people hostage while they push their disastrous 7-year balanced budget plan. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. GINGRICH, and the Republican leadership must join Senator DOLE and the entire Senate and pass a continuing resolution now, now to reopen Government.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the American people want, that is what they need, and that is what this body must do.

WHAT IS RADICAL OR EXTREME ABOUT BALANCING THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS?

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today some in the national media and some for partisan political purposes are accusing House Republicans of being extremists or radicals.

If ever there was an inside the beltway line, this has to be it.

Out in the country, the overwhelming majority of the people do not see anything radical or extreme about trying to balance the budget in 7 years.

Most people wonder why we cannot do it sooner than that.

Most families have to balance their budgets every year.

And then there are the so-called cuts. James K. Glassman, the Washington Post columnist who is not partial to either party, has called the Republican budget the ''No-Cut Budget.''

Federal spending has almost tripled in the last 15 years.

One agency that we have supposedly gutted is the EPA, yet their spending has doubled in the last 10 years.

Very few people out in the country, in the private sector, have had their salaries doubled or tripled in the last 10 or 15 years.

So when people hear these crocodile tears coming out of Washington, or they read some misleading report about a cut, they should ask what that agency was getting 10 years ago, all years of very low inflation.

And they should remember that Federal spending goes way up every year under the 7-year budget passed by the House.

EVERY DAY OF SHUTDOWN COSTS APPROXIMATELY $50 MILLION

(Mrs. KENNELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, on day 20 of the longest Government shutdown in history, once again yesterday the Republican majority refused to open the Government. This is a cruel, unnecessary hardship. There is not a businessowner in this country who would demand that his or her employees cease working and forgo their paychecks indefinitely. There is not a private employee in this country who would be expected to tolerate such treatment. Yet our Federal workers are forced to accept idleness or to work without pay.

Meanwhile, taxpayers are also paying an unfair price. Who is eliminating health and safety violations while OSHA is closed? Who is making sure laid-off workers are going to get the compensation they paid into? Who is looking out for the integrity of worker pension plans? In a word—nobody.

But everybody—every taxpayer—will be footing the bill for this fiasco. Every day of shutdown costs approximately $50 million. Talk about Government waste.

This situation is wrong. I urge my colleagues, pass legislation to open the Government.

THE 104TH CONGRESS WILL BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I entered politics because I thought I could make a difference. As a Republican, as a proponent of a balanced budget, and as a Member of the 104th Congress, I truly feel that I have, in a small way, made a positive difference. I am very confident that in the coming days America will have a balanced budget—something the American people have demanded for many, many years.

Now, let me say that I truly feel sorry for those who are unfairly caught up in the middle of this partial Government shutdown. But, let me also add that I would feel even more shame and sorrow if we failed to discipline our Government.

We must, as a government, as leaders, think of the future and think also of our children. We must balance the budget and restore the ethic of living within our means.

This 104th Congress has made a difference and we will balance the budget.

GIVE CREDIT WHERE CREDIT IS DUE

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the freshmen House Republicans. They have been unfairly maligned. Blaming them for this Government shutdown is like blaming the followers of the Pied Piper for being mesmerized by him. They voted with Speaker GINGRICH 92.3 percent of the time in 1995. Marching in lockstep with him is the only step that they know. No, we should give credit where credit is due. Speaker GINGRICH is individually as responsible for this shutdown as he was for the cry-baby shutdown in November. He could end personally this shutdown in 15 minutes this morning if he would simply put Republican BOB DOLE's resolution here for a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there would be bipartisan support for it from almost every member of the Democratic caucus and some of the Republicans, but instead of letting people of moderation, of good will, work together to end this shutdown and the $40 million a day that it costs the American taxpayer, they are asking that the Speaker be given extraordinary power to recess this body until January 23. That is simply fanaticism run amok in this body.

A NEW YEAR'S RESOLUTION

(Mr. FUNDERBURK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I was prepared for almost anything when I came to Washington 1 year ago today, but I never thought that I would spend my time defending my constituents in an all out war being waged against them by President Clinton. First, Bill Clinton decides to send $40 billion to bail out Mexico, while our national debt stands at $4.9 trillion and of course he does not want to balance the budget. This is a slap in the face of the workers in my district, who have already lost jobs that moved to Mexico as a result of NAFTA. Then the President and his FDA decided to attack the small tobacco farmers in my district, who struggle from year to year just to make ends meet. These are the people who provide the jobs, pay the taxes, and fight our wars. Clinton liberals are using tobacco as a politically correct shipping boy while a member of his administration called for the legalization of cocaine. Now, Mr. Clinton in a desperate attempt to salvage his reelection, is sending young men and women from my district to Bosnia. Many casualties are the likely result, and for what American national security interest? Mr. Speaker, I have a New Year's resolution for Bill Clinton; stop waging war against the citizens of the Second District of North Carolina.

LAYOFFS AND GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN: JUST THE BEGINNING OF A TWO-PRONGED ATTACK ON THE AMERICAN MIDDLE CLASS

(Ms. MCKINNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, AT&T lays off 40,000 employees at a time when profits have never been better. The Republican Congress furloughs 260,000 Federal workers for no reason other than to use them as human shields in the GOP jihad to provide tax cuts to companies like AT&T.

This, Mr. Speaker, is just the beginning of a two-pronged attack on the American middle class. Daily, I get calls from constituents wondering why they cannot go back to work while negotiations over the budget continue. Even BOB DOLE has said enough is enough and that Federal workers should return to work.

However, our noble Speaker of the House, whose behavior resembles that of the King of Prussia, insists on keeping Federal workers off the job until the President goes along with his attack on Medicare. Mr. Speaker, BOB DOLE is right, enough is enough.

REPUBLICANS ARE WINNING AND ARE MAKING A DIFFERENCE ON THE BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. CHAMBLISS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor and a privilege to serve the people of Georgia in Congress this past year. I truly feel that we have changed the way Congress and Washington operate. It is no longer business as usual and status quo. This past year has been long. It has been arduous, and obviously the work continues as we try to make sure the President honors his commitment to balance the budget in 7 years. But I am proud to say that we are winning. This 104th Congress has totally changed the terms of political debate. It is no longer should we balance the budget, it is now a matter of how soon we get the President to keep his word to balance the budget. It is no longer should we make government smaller, it is now a matter of how small.

Mr. Speaker, Republicans are making a difference. We have stood firm for

real change, and we will not back out of our commitment to do the right thing and balance the budget.

IF THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT WORKING THEN AT LEAST THE CONGRESS SHOULD BE

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, this is day 20 of the partial Government shutdown.

Yesterday the Eastern Panhandle Social Service Agency called to tell me the first Federal worker was facing eviction. Another Federal worker told me yesterday that his mortgage company would not accept even partial payment for his mortgage. Today I have contacted the West Virginia Bankers Association asking that its member banks work closely with Federal employees facing financial difficulties. They are not unemployed because of any fault of their own, and if, as the Republican leadership promises, they are going to be paid eventually, they deserve credit forbearance. But even that does not help with the checkout line at the grocery store, paying the heating bill, or buying the kids' shoes.

Now there is word that the Gingrich Republican leadership wants to recess the House for 3 weeks leaving the Government partially shut down. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the Government going on another recess while the Government is still shut down and taxpayers pay $40 million a day for services they are not receiving.

I voted yesterday to open the Government up. I am going to vote today against letting the Congress leave today. Mr. Speaker, if the Government is not working, then at least the Congress should be.

□ 1030

LIBERAL GIVEAWAY

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, A well-known news magazine this week called tax cuts a ''giveaway.''

That illustrates precisely the liberal mind-set of some in the media and most in this administration.

They actually think that the money of hard-working, lawabiding taxpayers belongs to the Government, not to the people who earned it.

Tax cuts mean American families will keep more. Liberals in the media and in the administration want the Government to take more and spend more.

Americans now are staggering under the heaviest tax burden in history. And the top half of wage earners already pay 95 percent of all income taxes.

The real question is: Who knows best how to spend hard-earned dollars—the American people or the Federal Government?

HISTORIC HEIGHTS OF IRRESPONSIBILITY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have risen to historic heights of irresponsibility led by our history professor. What a shame. What a shame. A previous speaker said that we needed a key to unlock Government, and he did not have the key. He was wrong.

This is the key given to all 435 of us by the voters of our districts. It is a district question for each of us to be reasonable and responsible. We had that opportunity yesterday and we had a vote, and of all of the Republicans in the House, only two, only two of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], used this card to unlock the lockout of Government employees and Government services to the American public.

My friend from Virginia who spoke previously said, stop making this a partisan issue. BOB DOLE is the leading candidate for President in the Republican Party. He said, this does not make sense.

MEMBERS SHOULD HAVE SALARIES WITHHELD DURING SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. MORELLA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, this is day 20 of the partial shutdown of Federal Government; 760,000 Federal employees did not receive their paychecks, and 280,000 of them cannot even report to work, although I hear many of them are trying very hard to do so; they do want to work.

I am a Federal employee. If our Federal employees are not being paid, I am having my salary withheld just as they are having their salaries withheld. They are being held hostage.

Also, I am here to work. I am not furloughed, and I will stay here to work, and I will vote against this House recessing until we have our Federal Government operating fully again. It is our responsibility; let us rise to it on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue and open up Government.

CHILD SUPPORT SUFFERS DURING SHUTDOWN

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, it is truly difficult to balance the family budget when you do not know when the next check is coming in. I know, because 28 years ago I was a single working mother with three small children, and I never received the child support that I was owed. Yet, as we head into the 20th day of the Gingrich Government shutdown, that is the same situation that the new majority is forcing on thousands of American families. Each day the Gingrich shutdown drags on, approximately 20,000 deadbeat parents get off the hook from paying their child support.

It is one thing being poor, Mr. Speaker, but not knowing when and if a check will come in severely compounds the problem.

By continuing to insist on huge Medicare cuts and education cuts and massive special interest tax breaks, the Gingrich Republicans are leaving thousands of American families in limbo, not knowing when they will receive their next child support check. It is time to end the Gingrich shutdown.

CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT SHARE BLAME FOR SHUTDOWN

(Mr. DAVIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, this is disgraceful. We have Members over here saying it is GINGRICH's fault, it is the President's fault. it is all of our faults, folks. We have not been able to get our act together. We could pass a continuing resolution. I favor doing that, and I voted yesterday with my colleagues to do it. But the President could have signed the appropriation bills, or he could have put a balanced budget on the table and that would end this entirely too. So we all share blame.

One of the most outrageous proposals I have seen is to recess this Congress until January 23. If we recess the time to move the discharge petition, that will take a longer period of time. I think that is wrong. We ought to bring this to a vote and let the House vote on it. Congress would go home for nearly 3 weeks and leave the Government unfunded. We would be asking Federal workers to work at their jobs for a period of 1 month and not pay them, if you can imagine that, while we being fully paid would go back to our districts.

I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] who just talked. While we vacation back home, we would be asking Federal workers to work without pay. It is wrong, it would be a disgrace, it would send a signal to the American people, let them eat cake. I will oppose it, Mr. Speaker.

SIGNS OF OUR TIMES

(Mr. GUTIERREZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, across the county, Americans are looking for some signs. Signs of progress. Signs of leadership. Signs of decency. Unfortunately, this is still the only sign they see. ''Closed.'' Why? Simple. Because of the close-minded radical right—Members who refuse to see any side to this issue other than their own.

But it is not just their minds that are closed. The Gingrich Republicans have closed their eyes, too. They close their eyes to the pain that their gutless gamesmanship has caused.

Seniors and children are denied nutrition programs, unemployed workers can not get benefits, and all the GOP does is talk about ''holding the President's feet to the fire.'' Meanwhile, innocent Americans huddle around a fire to keep warm.

Yes—this GOP majority has opened its backrooms to big business lobbyists to help them write new laws. But it closes the door on hardworking Government employees who implement and enforce those laws.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you and your side of the aisle, to open up our minds, and say ''Yes, we are open.'' Open the Government, now.

A CLEAR MISSION

(Mr. FRISA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRISA. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today I walked into this great House as a brandnew Member of Congress representing Long Island, NY. When I did that, I had one mission 1 year ago, and that was to do things differently, to get away from the rhetoric and the empty words that really are not truthful.

The simple fact is, we have done our job. The President does not like it. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle certainly do not like it.

Here is the result of our work product. We promised a balanced budget; we delivered it. Here it is. Mr. Speaker, anyone in this country who would like to get a copy of this real budget, call my office, 202–225–5516; I will send you one.

If you would like to see the President's alternative balanced budget, you do not have to call. You can see it right here. You cannot really see it, because it does not exist.

The President of the United States has not done his job. Though he has done a lot of yakking, and he has done a lot of blabbing; he has not rolled up his sleeves and done the real work and put numbers on the table.

UTAH CELEBRATES 100 YEARS OF STATEHOOD

(Mr. ORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I join my fellow Utahns in celebrating Utah's Statehood Centennial. One hundred years ago, on January 4, 1896, my home State of Utah became the 45th State in the Union.

Utah had spent nearly 50 years attempting to become a State, and had been turned down six times by 1896. But the patriotic and pioneering spirit of those who settled in the Utah territory prevailed, and the news of the long sought after statehood was received with great rejoicing and enthusiasm as thousands of citizens participated in parades and celebrations on that cold January morning, celebrations being reenacted in Utah today.

Over the past 100 years, citizens of Utah have served our great Nation with distinction through military, government, civic, and religious activities.

Today, Utah enjoys the strongest economy and is among the most rapidly growing States in the Nation. It is without prejudice that we declare Utah to be the greatest place on Earth.

It is my honor to serve the people of Utah in this, the people's House of Representatives. Today, we in the Congress honor the contributions which Utahns have made to our Nation over the past century and look forward with great anticipation to the opportunities of service to one another in the next century.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 393

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 393.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. REGULA moves to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto message on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto message of the President to the bill H.R. 1977 and on the veto message itself, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, today we have an opportunity to correct a serious problem, and that is the lack of access to the Nation's treasures that result from the veto by the President of the Interior appropriations bill.

It is a good bill. We worked hard on it on both sides of the aisle. It was recommitted twice to the conference to take care of the problems of the Tongass to satisfy the environmental concerns and also to take care of the need for a mining moratorium. Those issues were addressed, and I think out of the give and take of the conference and the recommittals, we arrived at a good bill, a bill that is fair and a bill that is nonpartisan.

There are many projects that need to be finished that were in Members' districts, both Republican and Democrat. The parks, of course, serve all of the people of the United States, as well as do the cultural institutions downtown.

I want to say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that on December 20, 89 Members of the minority voted to override the President on securities litigation reform. That is a pretty esoteric bill, and I am going to borrow a phrase from my good friends on the other side of the aisle and say that was an override for the rich, because people involved in securities are pretty much well-to-do people; they certainly are not the average American.

They found it in their hearts to override the President's veto on a bill with a very narrow constituency, a bill that will be beneficial to a limited number of people.

Today we are asking my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us in voting to override a bill that affects 260 million Americans. This is an override for the people, and I would hope that the 89 Members of the other party that voted to override the President on a very sophisticated piece of legislation, affecting only a handful of Americans relatively, certainly would want to do the same for the 260 million Americans that want access to the treasures of this Nation.

Today we have an opportunity to open the facilities that Americans care about, to give them an opportunity if they come to the Nation's Capital to visit the Vermeer exhibit, one of the world's great treasures, at the National Gallery, which is scheduled to leave, I think, February 11, a very limited opportunity of time; an opportunity to see the marvelous exhibits at the Smithsonian; an opportunity for sportsmen that like to hunt ducks that are coming down the flyways and are stopping at the various facilities, one

in Arkansas that I am aware of, the season I think opens or should have opened January 1; an opportunity for people that want to go to Philadelphia and see the Liberty Bell; an opportunity to visit the Holocaust Museum.

All we need is for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, or for the 89 that wanted to override the securities legislation to say, let us open up these facilities to the American public, let us open our parks, let us open our forests.

□ 1045

What does a vote ''yes'' mean? A vote ''yes'' means that we can keep Indian schools open, it will provide welfare assistance to needy Indian children. A vote ''yes'' will ensure that essential services on Indian reservations, including health services, law enforcement, education, continue to be provided.

What will a ''no'' vote mean? A ''no'' jeopardized the health, the education, and the safety of over 1 million native Americans. Let me say here that we added, at the request of the administration, in the bill that they vetoed, we added prior to the veto, an extra $50 million for Indian programs. This was something I know that the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations was interested in.

A vote to override the President's veto will ensure the collection of Federal revenues. Most people do not realize that from mining, oil and gas leasing, and timber harvesting, we collect $8 billion, not million, $8 billion in Federal revenues. But those collections agencies, such as MMS, are paralyzed because of the fact that they do not have people on the job. We could very well lose a substantial amount of money.

A ''no'' vote will jeopardize the collection of the $8 billion that are generated by the activities in this bill.

A ''yes'' vote will put 130,000 Federal employees back to work. It will ensure that they can provide for their families.

All we need today is for the 89 that voted to override on securities legislation to vote to override the President today, and we will put those 130,000 employees on the job as early as tomorrow.

What does a vote ''no'' mean? It means they still live in an era of uncertainty. They have difficulty meeting their monthly payments.

What will a ''yes'' vote do for our national parks? Some 369 national parks will open their doors. I call on 89 of you to help us open the doors. It will open 500 national wildlife refuges, our 150 national forests, the National Gallery of Art, the Smithsonian, our natural and cultural treasures will be opened to the public.

A ''no'' vote will lock the doors, will deny 260 million Americans access to those things that they treasure, the parks, the forests, the fish and wildlife facilities, the National Gallery, the Smithsonian, the Holocaust Museum. A ''no'' vote is to keep them out. It is very important that the American public understand that a ''no'' vote today is to deny access to these marvelous facilities.

What will a ''yes'' vote do for the American people? It means that they will have the things that they treasure. It means that they can appreciate their great out-of-doors, the public lands, the forests, the hiking and the camping areas, and these are a part of what we talk about in family values. A ''yes'' vote means that that family that wants to camp out in a national forest or a national park will have an opportunity to do so. A vote ''yes'' is a vote for the American people. A vote ''no'' is to say you are locked out, no access to the things that you treasure so much and that belong to all the Americans.

So I say to my colleagues, the right vote today is a vote ''yes.'' If you can vote ''yes'' to take care of a handful of lawyers that deal in securities litigation, you certainly can vote ''yes'' to let 260 million Americans have access to the things they treasure, to the things that they own, to the things that are part of their heritage of this great Nation.

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	563,936,000	568,062,000	-29,174,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000	.....	.....	.....	-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,482,000	.....	.....	.....	-121,176,000
Wildland fire management	.....	.....	235,924,000	240,159,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazmat account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,068,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,815,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,500,000	+91,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	8,500,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,957,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,367,000	95,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,883,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	8,993,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	7,605,000	.....
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction	53,768,000	34,095,000	26,355,000	36,775,000	37,655,000	-16,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	6,687,000	8,700,000	8,019,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,900,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	38,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,169,000	600,000	600,000	600,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,983,000	12,000,000	4,500,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahonton Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund	.....	152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	.....	400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	566,938,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000	.....	145,965,000	.....	-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,738,000	1,088,249,000	1,092,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,094,000	37,649,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	36,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,688,000	179,883,000	114,888,000	118,480,000	143,225,000	-24,463,000
Urban park and recreation fund	6,000	2,300,000	.....	.....	.....	-6,000
Land and water conservation fund (rescission of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	.....
Land acquisition and state assistance	87,373,000	82,696,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	49,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund	.....	15,200,000	.....	.....	.....	.....
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,338,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,462,000	586,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	188,181,000	193,348,000	186,558,000	182,169,000	182,994,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	.....
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,998,000	188,609,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,189,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-689,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	93,251,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	176,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs	1,519,012,000	1,608,842,000	1,509,626,000	1,261,234,000	1,384,434,000	-134,578,000
Construction	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,145,000	82,745,000	80,645,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund	1,996,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-1,996,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises	1,966,000	1,966,000	.....	900,000	500,000	-1,466,000
Indian direct loan program account	779,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account	9,671,000	9,684,000	.....	7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,671,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	.....	(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,885,000	40,468,000	37,468,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	.....
Subtotal	78,201,000	69,232,000	52,405,000	68,188,000	65,188,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands	19,800,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association	13,574,000	10,038,000	14,618,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,536,000
Mandatory payments	10,000,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	14,900,000	+4,900,000
Subtotal	23,574,000	24,938,000	29,518,000	24,938,000	24,938,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management	62,479,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,683,000
Office of the Solicitor	34,608,000	35,361,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	34,608,000	.....
Office of Inspector General	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	.....
Construction Management	1,996,000	2,000,000	.....	500,000	500,000	-1,496,000
National Indian Gaming Commission	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	.....
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians	.....	.....	.....	16,338,000	16,338,000	+16,338,000
Total, Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,692,000
Appropriations	(6,537,897,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,190,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,053,205,000)	(-484,692,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	.....
Crime trust fund	.....	(15,200,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....
(Limitation on direct loans)	(10,890,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans)	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)	.....	(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research	193,748,000	203,796,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry	154,268,000	187,459,000	129,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund	17,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-17,000,000
International forestry	4,987,000	10,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-4,987,000
National forest system	1,328,893,000	1,348,755,000	1,266,888,000	1,247,543,000	1,256,253,000	-72,640,000
Forest Service fire protection	159,285,000	164,285,000	.....	.....	.....	-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund	226,200,000	239,000,000	.....	.....	.....	-226,200,000
Emergency appropriations	450,000,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management	.....	.....	385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction	199,215,000	192,338,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	163,500,000	-35,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	.....
Land acquisition	63,862,000	65,311,000	14,600,000	41,167,000	41,200,000	-22,662,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	1,069,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite)	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	.....
Range betterment fund (indefinite)	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Total, Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology	-337,879,000	-155,019,000	.....	.....	.....	+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development	423,701,000	436,508,000	379,524,000	376,181,000	417,169,000	-6,532,000
(By transfer)	(17,000,000)	.....	.....	.....	.....	(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite)	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves	187,048,000	101,028,000	151,028,000	136,028,000	148,786,000	-38,262,000
Energy conservation	755,751,000	923,561,000	556,371,000	576,976,000	553,293,000	-202,458,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer)	.....	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000	-16,000,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,297,000	8,038,000	6,297,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness	8,233,000	8,219,000	.....	.....	.....	-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve	135,954,000	25,669,000	.....	.....	.....	-135,954,000
(By transfer)	(90,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+96,236,000)
Energy Information Administration	84,566,000	84,689,000	79,766,000	64,766,000	72,266,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy	1,266,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services	1,709,780,000	1,816,350,000	1,725,792,000	1,615,373,000	1,747,842,000	+38,062,000
Indian health facilities	253,282,000	242,672,000	236,975,000	151,227,000	238,958,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,600,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses	313,853,000	329,800,000	309,471,000	307,968,000	308,188,000	-5,665,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings	23,954,000	34,000,000	24,954,000	33,954,000	33,954,000	+10,000,000
Construction	21,857,000	38,700,000	12,950,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses	52,902,000	54,566,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings	4,016,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	6,442,000	+2,426,000
Total, National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,800,000	10,323,000	10,323,000	.....
Construction	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	.....
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	.....
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration	133,846,000	143,675,000	82,259,000	88,765,000	82,259,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants	28,512,000	28,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration	146,131,000	156,087,000	82,469,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-52,131,000
Matching grants	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	363,117,000	384,200,000	219,988,000	241,000,000	230,494,000	-132,623,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	.....
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salaries and expenses	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salaries and expenses	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salaries and expenses	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000			-2,738,000
Public development	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund		1,388,000				
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, title II, Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net)	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,164,636,000	-1,354,594,000
Appropriations	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,083,099,000)	(12,194,636,000)	(-1,354,594,000)
Rescission	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund		(15,200,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite)	(-44,769,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer)	(107,764,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,682,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,038,000	702,817,000	568,936,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-67,174,000
National Biological Service	162,041,000	172,696,000		145,965,000		-162,041,000
National Park Service	1,387,329,000	1,490,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,336,000	1,319,337,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey	571,462,000	586,369,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,996,000	188,809,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,808,000	1,459,912,000	1,571,412,000	-159,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior	6,507,897,000	6,855,935,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	6,023,205,000	-484,692,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy	1,265,887,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,566,000	1,143,589,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
Indian Health Service	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,767,000	1,966,800,000	1,986,800,000	+23,738,000
Indian Education	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,345,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution	362,706,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art	56,918,000	64,451,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	58,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts	19,308,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,308,000	19,308,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Endowment for the Arts	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs	7,500,000	6,941,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	5,090,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council	26,609,000	28,707,000	28,707,000	26,609,000	28,707,000	+2,098,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,141,431,000	-869,902,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation			-12,799,000			
Grand total	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,164,636,000	-1,354,594,000

Mr. REGULA. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Ohio is trying to continue a coverup. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, why he does not come in with a good bill, a bill of which we on the committee can be proud, instead of trying to revive a dead, discredited bill.

We should approve not only a clean continuing resolution, and then we can pass an Interior bill the President can sign, not this bill, which the President rightfully vetoed. The gentleman did not indicate the defects in this bill, and we know why the President vetoed the Interior conference bill, because it is a bad bill and it would have been wrong on the part of the President to sign this bill.

My good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, at the last time this bill was on the floor, got up before the House and said that we all know why the Government is shut down, it is because the President vetoed this bill. Well, of course the President vetoed this bill because it was the right thing to do. He vetoed the bill because it slashes funding for the Native Americans by $325 million.

My friend from Ohio talks about the additional $50 million they have put in. That is a sop, a pittance, when one realize that the original cut to the funds for the Native Americans was over $400 million by the Senate, almost a half billion dollars.

The President vetoed the bill because the low income weatherization program is gutted by lack of appropriations. He vetoed the bill because the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities are cut in half. He vetoed the bill because America's greatest forest, the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, will be increased in its cut of timber by one-third. If its harvests in the past are any indication, the cut will be a clear-cut, as well. It treats the Native Americans like second-class citizens. It suspends the environmental laws that give the public a right to protest the breaches to the environmental laws that the increases in the cuts are liable to make.

My good friends in the majority do not believe this veto override will be successful. My friend from Ohio points out all the things that an override of this veto will bring. Well, the evils in this bill are such that the President could not possibly have signed the bill. Those wrongs will continue, because I am sure that the President continues the same frame of mind.

There has been no effort on the part of the majority to rework this bill. The conference took care of the moratorium for mining and little else.

As I indicated, the chairman of the committee, and it is indicated, also, by my friend from Ohio that the veto of the President was responsible for the closing of the Government. The fact is that the wrongs in this bill were emphasized by the House's veto on two separate occasions of this bill. Motions to recommit the bill to committee were approved by the House. So they believed, along with the President, that this was not a good bill. If it is not a good bill, why, then, does the gentleman from Ohio ask for an override?

All of these wrongs could be satisfied by passing a clean continuing resolution, as has been pointed out so frequently. Because that continuing resolution is not passed, because this is such a bad bill, our national parks are closed, the National Gallery of Art is closed, and the Vermeer exhibition is barred from showing to the public through the expenditure of public funds, although the Mellon Foundation, as it has done so frequently in the past, has come to the rescue of the Vermeer exhibition, and the public will be allowed to see it until its scheduled time for closing takes place.

The Smithsonian is shut down. Millions of Americans whose livelihood depends upon the Interior Department, the Forest Service, and upon other agencies are left out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, let me give some examples of what is happening as a result of what the closedown of the Government is doing to this bill.

Welfare assistance to 53,000 Indian families has been ended. Child welfare assistance to 3,000 Indian children in foster homes and orphanages is cut off. Indian tribes that rely on funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs are having to furlough employees, close schools, and close tribal jails. Over 383,000 visitors have been turned away from the national parks, having a devastating effect on towns and businesses that rely on that tourism.

Local communities are losing over $14 million every day because of the park closures. Thousands of service industry workers have lost their jobs as a result.

The Park Service has been forced to evict people who are camping in the Everglades National Park in Florida. The Minerals Management Service is prevented from issuing permits to begin exploration or development of authorized offshore oil and gas deposits. A Federal criminal trial against an international wildlife smuggling ring in Chicago has been delayed because the Fish and Wildlife Service cannot provide crucial assistance to the Justice Department. The National Biologic Service has been prevented from investigating an alarming increase in the death of bald eagles and sea otters.

The list of hardships and tragedies, Mr. Speaker, goes on an on. The Nation burns and the House of Representatives fiddles. We should have had meetings of the full committee, not just of the chairman of the House subcommittee and the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, to decide what will go into the bill. Other members of the committee have contributions to make, as well.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, we must defeat this motion to override the President's veto, and only then can we have a serious discussion of how to fix up the Interior bill which the President was so correct in vetoing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that we respond to the gentleman from Illinois.

Number one, he made a great case for overriding the President's veto. He pointed out all of the things that are happening, how people are being penalized in so many different ways, how the health is in jeopardy for Indians and so on. There is a very simple way to cure that, I would say to the gentleman, my friend from Illinois, and that is, vote to override the President's veto.

This bill, as we well know, has a lot of good things in it. Let me just mention a couple.

We are talking about the Native Americans being second class. One-fourth, 25 percent of the money in this bill is for Native Americans, $3 billion. They are hardly second class when we are appropriating 3 billion taxpayer dollars to support the many and varied programs. As I would point out, we did respond, actually we put more in the conference and in the bill that finally went to the White House than was requested by the President during earlier negotiations.

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

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman knows that the amount requested by the President was $1.9 billion. The amount that the conference approved and which is in this bill is $325 million less than the amount requested by the President.

Mr. REGULA. As the gentleman would recognize, though, that in the negotiations, and I want to address that, the gentleman said that we made no attempt to work with the White House. We did and I have a whole list of things here that we changed in response to the White House. They said initially, and I would add they keep moving the goal posts, that is part of the problem; we no sooner respond to the White House's request than the goalposts move.

□ 1100

They asked for $110 million, this is not the original request, this is after we were in conference, they asked for $110 million over the Senate-passed level. We ended up with $111.5 million over the Senate, plus $25 million additional for the Indian Health Service. And I could go through the whole list of things that the White House requested during the conference to which we responded, perhaps not totally, but as much as possible.

Part of what is at issue here is how much we are going to spend. I have to

agree, we are not spending as much as the minority party would like. But the American people have said, we are not willing to borrow money from our grandchildren to fund today's programs. So the allocation to us was 10 percent under 1995's appropriation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, does the gentleman think the American people want the Indian children to be deprived of their food and of their necessities of life? This bill and the failure to provide a clean continuing resolution are doing that. The gentleman knows it as well.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would only point out that with $3 billion, they are not actually being deprived. That is a lot of money. It goes to these many programs. The person that is depriving the Indians of access to these funds is the President of the United States. I hope that 89 of my colleagues will recognize that today, as they did on the securities litigation legislation, and will support the fact that we want this $3 billion to go to the Indian programs.

The gentleman mentioned increasing cuts. Certainly we had to reduce spending to meet the 10 percent reduction goal. But I have to say that I think we have done a responsible job, given the fiscal constraints.

The gentleman and I have served on this committee for many years together and in the past years we were always able to spend more each year. That made life easy. We just added another 5 percent to everybody's program or 3 or whatever the number was, and everybody was happy. Because the American people, in November of 1994, said, wait a minute, we do not want to put our grandchildren in debt. They already owe $20,000 apiece. We do not want to add to that for Government programs. So as a result the Committee on the Budget gave us 10 percent less than 1995. So instead of having an increase, as we have had in the past, we had a reduction. So we did it and we worked together in many respects.

We did the must-dos. We flat funded the parks, the Smithsonian, the National Gallery so they can stay open for the public, the Forest Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service. We did the need-to-does, things that needed to be fixed, repairs and so on. The nice-to-dos took a hit. There is no question about it. We abolished the Bureau of Mines. We did a number of other things. But frankly, unless we are willing to continue borrowing money from future generations, we are simply going to have to restrain our spending. That is what we did here. We tried to do it in a fair manner. I do not think the gentleman would disagree that given the fiscal constraints we had that we were at least bipartisan in allocating the money.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, will the gentleman tell me why the majority, the Republican majority agreed to increase the cut for the Tongass forest by at least a third?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman that the original was, I think, something like 450. We got it back to 418. But the money we put in the bill, which is the real world, limits the cut to exactly or a little less than has been cut in the past during the time that the gentleman was chairman of this committee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman be surprised in the event that the cut went beyond the amount that he says will be authorized by, paid for by the 320?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would be surprised because history tells us that the money we put in will probably result in a smaller cut, and I would also point out to the gentleman that it is the President's chief of the Forest Service, appointed by the President, that is managing the Tongass as part of the Forest Service. Therefore, decisions that are made along the lines the gentleman is discussing will be made by the employees or certainly the executive branch appointees that have responsible positions. There is no way that they can, by magic, create money out of the air so that with the money that is in the bill, the cut really is restricted to what we have had in the past.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman tell us why the Republican majority agreed to nullify the environmental laws by depriving the public of the right to protest the increases in the cuts?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman No. 1, in the recommittal we took out the sufficiency language with the exception of one sale. This is a parallel to what happened when the gentleman was chairman on the Oregon situation at the request of Senator HATFIELD. Any further sales other than the one that is just changing the location are subject to sufficiency language, which means it has to go through the courts, through the EPA and all the requirements.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, has the sufficiency language been taken out of the cut in the Northwest States of the United States?

Mr. REGULA. The language that was placed in the bill that the gentleman was chairing?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the bill that I chaired that had sufficiency language goes back something like 8 or 9 years. There was no sufficiency language after that. It was done for one time only. Yet there is sufficiency language for the amendment that was introduced by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE]. The people of the State of Arizona, the environmental community is deprived of the opportunity of protesting because of sufficiency language.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I notice that the President never even mentioned that in his override message.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman know why?

Mr. REGULA. Because they were a party to it.

Mr. YATES. On the contrary, Mr. Speaker, it was put in because the amendment of the gentleman from Arizona was put in after the President's statement had been drafted.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, how could he write the statement until he had the bill? He vetoed the bill at 11 a.m. We did not get the veto message until 5 p.m. explaining his decision. So he had 6 hours, if he wanted to get it in there.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the fact remains that the gentleman has not replied to my point about the sufficiency language being in the bill as being applicable to the cut that takes place in the forests of the Northwest.

Mr. REGULA. Well, we are having a good discussion. I do not want to use too much of my time here.

Mr. YATES. But the gentleman has not really answered my question.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I am not sure what the gentleman is referring to. We had one instance, just as he had one instance when he was chairman, of sufficiency language being included and that was on a sale in the Tongass that has already gone through all the environmental steps. It is just that the people that were going to purchase it are out of business so it is a moving of that sale to another purchaser. But the environmental requirements had all been met. That is the reason we put sufficiency on that one item. I agree we had it in originally on the Tongass generally, but we took that out. That was one of the things that was negotiated on the recommittals.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, what about the marbled murrelet provision? The marbled murrelet provision, is that not still subject to sufficiency language?

Mr. REGULA. The marbled murrelet is in the bill that went to the White House.

Mr. YATES. It is subject to sufficiency language, is it not?

Mr. REGULA. No, that is not. That is a different issue, and we only had the one sufficiency, similar to what the gentleman had in the bill for Oregon some years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am simply stuck here, forced to repeat much of what I said yesterday on two previous veto overrides. Nothing real is happening here today. There is no real legislation which is being pursued here today.

Everybody knew the President was going to veto this bill. He made it quite clear. He indicated he was not going to sign a bill which has a huge increase in logging in the Tongass, one of the few temperate rain forests left in the world. He made it quite clear that he was not going to accept the reversal of

the California Desert Protection Act, which passed last year. He made it quite clear he was not going to support other provisions, including major reductions in weatherization programs for low-income people trying to stay warm in a cold winter.

But this is not about the veto. Everybody knows this veto is not going to be overridden. The only reason we are having this silly debate on the floor here today is because the majority party is trying to keep off the floor any effort to open up the entire Government. So this is a time filler. We are going to waste 2 hours on something which is going nowhere.

Now, I would simply point out, in contrast to what my good friend from Ohio has said, the President did not shut down the Government. Presidents have for time immemorial vetoed legislation which they thought was out of whack. Those vetoes did not shut down the Government because previous Congresses were responsible enough to pass continuing resolutions so that the Government remained open.

This Congress has refused to do that because there is a strategic decision which has been made by Mr. GINGRICH and his clones. That decision has been that unless the President is going to accept their reductions in Medicare, their reductions in Medicaid, their reductions in education, and their other demands in the 7-year budget negotiations going on in another room on other subjects—unless the President is going to cave on that collection of issues, that in order to put the squeeze on the President—they are going to keep the Government closed. That is the decision that my colleagues on that side of the aisle have decided that they are going to make. They are apparently willing to take all the heat from the public that is going to be generated in order to get their way.

Collectively, they are holding their breath and turning blue until the President caves. That is what is going on.

Now, it seems to me that that is not what the public sent us here to do. I want to congratulate the action taken by the Senate majority leader, Senator DOLE. I think that action has defined the difference between fighting for principles within a rational construct and simply behaving like nihilists, pretending that you are principled. I really believe that the only way we are going to get out of this impasse is for our moderate friends on the Republican side of the aisle to recognize that sooner or later they are going to have to make a choice between following the rational leadership of someone like BOB DOLE or following the irrational leadership, in my view, of someone like Mr. GINGRICH.

Until my colleagues make that choice, the taxpayers are going to be stuck with the incredible spectacle of first seeing Government workers prevented from doing the work that they are being paid for and then later on seeing the spectacle of workers being required to work for which they are not getting paid. It is really an Alice-in-Wonderland world.

What ought to happen is very simple. My colleagues ought to stop this 2-hour charade. They ought to bring to the floor legislation which opens up the Government and allows everyone to go back to work. But that is not going to happen. The chairman of this committee summarized several weeks ago why it is not going to happen. He held a press conference after the President signed the defense appropriations bill and then said the following:

> If the Government shuts down on December 15 and 300,000 people are again out of work, most of the people going out will be his people; I think he is going to care more than we do.

That was said by the distinguished chairman and my good friend, the distinguished chairman of this committee, Mr. LIVINGSTON.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, the truth of this statement has been demonstrated. It is apparent that there is very little concern on that side of the aisle for the 300,000 Government workers who are being forced into these silly circumstances, and there is very little concern for the taxpayers who have a right to get the services for which they have already paid taxes. They have a right.

The Congress ought to quit this silly game. My colleagues ought to follow the lead of Senator DOLE. They ought to bring up that clean continuing resolution to open the Government so that we can continue to discuss our other differences like adults, without shooting innocent people in the process. Until they face up to their responsibilities and open up the Government, that is exactly what is happening.

□ 1115

All my colleagues are doing is shooting the innocent because of incredible arrogance that some people in this House have, the incredible arrogance to think that their political ideology is more important than the service we are supposed to provide our constituents. That is outrageous.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to first thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] for giving me 4 minutes, and I have to agree with everything that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has just said, and I would like to maintain that thought just a little longer because to me, what I am seeing happen in this House, and I have seen it since December 15, is something that I, who have served here now starting my 20th year, have never seen before, and I say that in the history of this country no one has ever seen before, no Member of this House in all those 207 years has seen the cynicism of what I call the radical right wing Republicans led by our Speaker in the approach to how we run the Government, and that approach is, Mr. Speaker, they use blackmail. If they cannot get their way on a balanced budget provision or reconciliation bill which they call a Balanced Budget Act, then they are going to shut down the Government until the President agrees to what they want in a balanced budget.

Now that is as simple as that, my colleagues. It is pure blackmail. I never thought that I would ever see a Member of Congress elected by his constituents elect to use a shutdown of the Government in order to get their views on something. We are seeing it right here today on this bill.

It is very apparent to me that the gentleman from Ohio, the gentleman from Arizona, the gentleman from Alaska, those on that side, are going to say, ''Well, we let you have a vote to override the President.'' Purse cynicism. Then they are not going to do anything more. They know the vote is not going to be in their favor, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has rightly proven. We are not going to override the President because there are things in this bill that many of us cannot accept.

Mr. Speaker, we are willing to compromise, like the President is, to work it out, but, no, not them. They have got to have their way, and their way only, and, if they do not get their way, then there is not going to be a CR.

We had the opportunity yesterday. Every one of us had that opportunity yesterday to keep the Government running, to let everybody go back to work. The people; like in my district I had a lady call me yesterday, my colleagues. She got a $50 paycheck yesterday. I asked, ''How would you like to—how would this staff, how would your staff, like to get a $50 paycheck?'' No, my colleagues are smart.

The gentleman from California, Mr. Speaker, who heads up the Legislative Subcommittee, yes, he was smart. The President was not quite seeing exactly what my colleagues were going to do.

I wish the President had never signed that legislative appropriation bill. He should never have done it. He should never do it next year. He should not sign the Defense appropriation bill next year. He should not sign his own next year until all the rest of these have been done because my colleagues are not just doing it now, they are going to propose—it is very clear to me that under the operation of GINGRICH, under their operation under Speaker GINGRICH, they plan to do this every time, not just this year, not just for this bill for this fiscal year, but for next year also. They are willing to put people in hardship, to let kids starve, just so that they can say we have to have our balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I want a balanced budget, too. I voted for one, I voted for one. But I do not want one with a big tax cut in it like my colleagues have got, I will not vote for one with a big tax cut

like my colleagues have, and the President will not ever sign one with a big tax cut like my colleagues have got. I will not vote for one that cuts Medicare for my elderly citizens like my colleagues have got, the President will not sign one like that. And my colleagues say, ''Okay, we'll shut down the Government,'' and that is just what they have done.

I ask, ''Why don't you do like your Presidential candidate, Senator DOLE? Why don't some of you, just 20 of you, come with us? We'll open up the Government.''

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to sit here and listen to the rhetoric that comes out from that side of the aisle, the outright mistruths very nearly close to the mistruths have been spoken by the President of the United States.

When I hear people talk about the Tongass, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], and, no, I will not yield. I listened to that tirade a while ago, and I will not yield. The Tongass does in fact—the provision of this bill froze the amount of timber that could be harvested. It froze it to 1.7 million acres. . . .

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, there are no truths in——

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the gentleman's words be taken down.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. The gentleman has to prove that he is telling the truth, and he is not.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. VOLKMER. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman will state his inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. My parliamentary inquiry is how far back will the stenographer, the reporter, go because it is our—at least my—when I asked for the words to be taken down, that the gentleman had used the word ''mistruth'' way back and continuously in reference to Members and to the President, and I would like for all of those words to be taken down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words most immediately complained of.

□ 1130

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Wisconsin will state his parlimentary inquiry.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, how do I make certain that the words which are going to be read back are the words to which I was objecting? Because the words to which I was objecting were the words that indicated that the gentleman from Illinois had uttered mistruths and had known that. Those are the words that I am specifically addressing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will direct the Clerk to report the words.

The Clerk read as follows:

> The gentleman keeps talking about the Tongass. It will be 90 percent in wilderness, and he knows it, and you told a mistruth every time on this issue, and you know that it is a mistruth. There is absolutely no truth, there is no truth. . . .

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the words.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. OBEY. No, I did not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri objects.

Mr. VOLKMER. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am reserving the right to object because, in my view, when a Member accuses another Member of purposely misleading the House, he owes it to the House to apologize. I will be happy to withdraw my objection if the gentleman apologizes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, it is rare that I apologize when I know I am speaking from my heart. It is rare that I ask this House to listen to a gentleman's understanding as he sees the issue. It is rare that I have to apologize when other gentlemen do not take the opportunity to read the facts on an issue.

The gentleman and I have discussed this for many, many years, and he and I know we differ. He knows my emotionalism on this. He knows I have lost over 42 percent of my working people in this area. He knows that I am a gentleman that would never impugn another gentleman. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. YATES. I do not know that.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Well, then, I apologize to you personally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw his objection?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I withdraw my objection, in light of the apology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alaska may proceed in order.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, may I again go back to what I said happened in the Tongass.

We froze the amount of timber to cut. We know, in fact, that it is 90 percent a wilderness. These are facts, my friends, facts, not fiction.

In fact, we know that only 10 percent, and only 10 percent, over 100 years would be cut. We know that there are 42 percent of my people out of work in southeast Alaska today because of action of this body, and we heard a lot about it is a shame that the President vetoed this. Then we talked about the people's hardships and the people that are out of work.

What about the people that are blue collar workers? Have I heard anybody on this floor defend them, other than myself and a few of my colleagues? I heard a gentleman a while ago say, we are going to hold our faces blue until we get our way. I would rather be blue than red.

I am going to suggest respectfully that this veto is wrong. The President shut down these parks; the President shut down the monuments. There is a letter today in the Washington Post about the police were on hand at the parks. Where were they before? They are issuing tickets to people, taxpayers. Where were they before?

This administration and this Secretary of Interior are using this for a political gambit. This is what this is all about. We did our job. We sent a bill to the President that the President could have signed and should have signed.

By the way, we heard a lot about the American natives. The American natives want to stand on their own, they want to manage their own affairs, they want to be able to decide their own destiny. They do not want to continue with handouts as the minority has been doing over these years to make them subservient. They want to be their own people. The best way, they have said to me, is we will take our cuts as long as everybody else does too. But this President has kept those moneys away from those people.

It is time that this Congress overrides this President, and you have that responsibility too.

Make no mistake about it. Mr. Speaker, the Interior appropriations veto was politics, pure poll-driven politics.

If you read the President's veto message and compare it to the White House press release, they are identical. Was the President trying to seriously communicate with the Congress or was this just a public relations exercise? I have never seen anything like it.

The President vetoed this bill with a press release, threw thousands of workers out of work right before the holiday, and then blamed the Congress. Shame on you, Mr. President.

This is a slap in the face of Chairman REGULA and Chairman LIVINGSTON. They sent a balanced bill to the White House that was sensitive to every concern raised by the President's staff.

This veto message also insults my constituents who live and work in the Tongass National Forest. It singled out a carefully drafted provision that would bring stability to my constituents who live and work in the Tongass.

The Tongass provision did 2 things: First, froze the amount of timber that could be harvested over 100 years at 1.7 million acres and, second, allowed the Forest Service to

convert timber sales from one purchaser to another. It did nothing more and nothing less.

The fact is, every issue raised by the Clinton administration was addressed in the bill.

The administration said it wanted the ability to use good science, so we allowed them to use sound scientific data under Chairman REGULA's bill.

The administration said it did not want a permanent ban on habitat conservation areas, so Chairman REGULA's bill removed the ban at their request.

After the bill passed the Congress, the President's staff had to find an excuse for him to veto it. The Environmental Mecca, the Tongass National Forest, served as excuse No. 1.

The veto message/press release makes it sound like the whole 17-million-acre forest would be clear-cut tomorrow if the bill became law. The fact is only 10 percent of the forest will ever be harvested during a 100-year period. The other 90 percent is off limits in wilderness status or not available for harvest.

It seems to me that your advisors told you about the wrong Tongass provision, Mr. President.

The reality for my constituents is that 42 percent of the timber employees in the Tongass are out of work. Timber is part of a well-rounded Alaskan economy. We have enough preservation in the Tongass to protect the resources and environment. We need some stability, Mr. President.

I urge my colleagues to override this poll-driven veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker and Members, this committee, the Subcommittee on Interior of the Committee on Appropriations, does a lot of great work; and in this legislation there are a lot of very good provisions. Unfortunately, this bill, which does so much for native Americans, which does so much for the natural resources of our country, is being held hostage by the Senator from Alaska and by those who seek to have special privilege in the Tongass National Forest, the only temperate rain forest in North America, the only one that belongs to the American people.

What they are seeking to do is to go back in time. In 1990 we passed a Tongass reform bill. They seek now to nullify that even though the Alaska delegation at that time said that they would agree to it if they could have 10 years of peace under the requirements of that bill.

What they seek to do now is to go back to a plan which received thousands and thousands of comments about its inadequacy for sustainability, about its inadequacy for Native rights, about its inadequacy for the environment; and they seek to legislate that plan in this bill. Why? Because the Pacific Timber Co. wants it that way; there are no ifs, ands, or buts about it.

The reason the Washington Monument is closed and the reason the Liberty Bell is seeking private donations, and the reason you cannot go snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park is because of the Louisiana Pacific and this legislation.

This is the worst of special-interest legislation. You cannot do what they want to do under this bill unless you waive the environmental laws of this Nation. You cannot do what they want to do under this bill unless you put in sufficient language to protect this corporation from a lawsuit that they have already lost in court.

We are here doing that in this legislation, and we are holding Indian children hostage. We are holding the health of Indian natives of this country hostage. We are holding the tourism economies of Yosemite National Park, Mariposa County, hostage, because Louisiana Pacific wants to do legislatively what they are afraid to do and come before our committee, the Committee on Natural Resources, and debate this openly about the Tongass.

The gentleman from Alaska previously said the Tongass is 90 percent wilderness. No, it is not. And when he says he only wants to cut 10 percent, he has to recognize this. The vast majority of Tongass is ice, rocks, lakes, and other things. The timber base is a very small business.

When you want to clear-cut 10 percent of that timber base and you want to do it without regard to the environmental laws of this country and without regard to the public planning process, you do great devastation to the remaining land base and the timber base in that area. That is why the Governor of Alaska is opposed to this process. That is why the Anchorage Daily News is opposed to this process. That is why the Alaska Outdoor Council, some 10,000 members, hunters, and fishermen, are opposed to this process. That is why the Alaska Wilderness Recreation and Tourism Association is opposed to this process, because you are legislating on them a single use for a great natural resource that is in fact increasing the economy of Alaska. It is diversifying the economy of Alaska.

The reason the logging economy went down in Alaska is because of a Japanese-owned mill that cannot get more Federal dollars and subsidies, for the taxpayers quit. They went out of business because they just could not get enough subsidies. Well, excuse me. Try the marketplace.

Now what we have is a struggle to try to get those lands that they have locked up under an old 50-year contract without environmental reviews, they are trying to bring that into the land base for this. So what? So they can get pulp and send it to Japan; so they can get logs and cant them and send them to Japan. There is no value added here for the American economy. But there is $102 million in the last 3 years lost in preparing these sales and cutting these roads.

So without $102 million of subsidies, these logs would never leave. These logs would continue to be trees. They would be vertical instead of horizontal. That is why. That is why.

That is why we must sustain the veto. We cannot have the special interests come into the Halls of Congress and dictate and say that we must set aside the laws so that they can have the special privilege of not having to put up with public input and public debate and a public planning process, so they do not have to suffer the indignities of losing a court case, so they do not have to suffer the scrutiny of the public subsidies to their private corporations.

That is what is holding hostage the National Park System, the Indian health system, the endangered species system in this country, the special interests of Louisiana Pacific and their associates.

The people of Alaska oppose this legislation; their newspapers oppose this, their tourism association and the Governor of the State oppose this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following material for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this effort to override the President's veto. President Clinton stood up for the environment and the taxpayers. We should support him.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deserve to know what's going on here. There's a hidden agenda in this bill that the Republicans do not like to highlight.

Why are our national parks closed and thousands of loyal employees out of work? It is because the Republican leadership allowed this spending bill to become a grab bag of legislative gifts for special interests who want to exploit our natural resources at taxpayer expense.

The Republicans apparently believe that it is more important to dictate a forest plan that will increase Federal spending to cut down 400-year-old trees in the Alaska rainforest than it is to reopen the national parks and put people back to work. But the Republicans just can't say no to Louisiana Pacific. That's what this fight is about—more taxpayer dollars to subsidize Louisiana Pacific and increase logging in the Tongass National Forest by over 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no valid reason to hold Federal workers, private sector contractors, and the rest of the public hostage to the Alaskan pulp mill barons. This Tongass rider doesn't belong on any appropriations bill. It hasn't been the subject of a single day of public hearings in the Resources Committee. The only thing the chairman from Alaska has pending in committee is his bill to give away the entire 17-million acre Tongass National Forest, abolishing the wilderness areas and national monuments in the process. It's no wonder that the Governor of Alaska is joined by so many other Alaskans in opposing this Tongass rider.

This bill is full of other antienvironmental legislative riders that wouldn't see the light of day if considered in the normal process. It guts the California Desert Protection Act. It stops progress in improving land management in the Columbia River Basin. It undercuts the Endangered Species Act. The list goes on.

Mr. Speaker, I would have hoped that we learned a lesson from the timber salvage rider

that passed on the rescissions bill earlier this Congress. There were no hearings on that legislative rider either. We were assured by proponents that it applied only to dead trees and burned trees. But what we later found out is that language was included to cut healthy forests in the Pacific Northwest. We found out that exempting the timber industry from the environmental laws of this country leads only to disaster.

Mr. Speaker, the President has made clear from the outset that the Tongass and the other legislative riders on this bill were unacceptable. Yet Republicans made only cosmetic changes in response. They alone share the blame by producing an Interior appropriations bill that tries to legislate bad policy rather than allocate public funds. They just can't say no to the special interests.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the veto override. Let the Republican majority instead get to work on producing a clean bill that is in the public interest. Let's get on with the business of governing and reopen the parks, monuments, refuges, and forests that are so important to the American people.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for his statement and point out that 90 percent of the Tongass Forest is not wilderness.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, of course it is not.

Mr. VENTO. Also, the 10 percent that we are talking about here may make up 50, 60 percent of the whole timber base in that forest.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Lands, we oversee the national parks, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Forest Service. On December 18, 1995, President Bill Clinton vetoed the Interior appropriations bill which would have provided funding to keep parks, forests, BLM recreation areas open to the public. In a staged press conference, President Clinton surrounded himself with children and said that for the sake of maintaining clean air and clean water for the children, he would have to veto the bill.

What the President failed to realize or point out was that the Interior appropriations bill funds the Department of the Interior agency and has nothing to do with the Environmental Protection Agency, which is charged with regulating the Nation's air and water. Rather than working with the Congress on resolving issues of substance, President Clinton has simply chosen to play politics. The bottom line is that the Clinton administration is using our national parks, forests, and BLM recreational areas as part of their strategy to thwart efforts to balance the Federal budget.

The national parks, forests, and all other Department of the Interior facilities would be open if President Clinton had just signed the Interior appropriations bill. His public excuses for not signing the bill simply do not wash.

In addition to killing the funding for the parks, the administration got enough Democratic support to kill a bipartisan bill in the House of Representatives which has facilitated States providing the support necessary to keep parks and wildlife refuges open during periods of budget impasse. It is clear that the administration is simply keeping facilities closed for political reasons alone.

In fact, it does not even require any legislation to keep parks open. Secretary Babbitt has full authority to accept donations to fund park operations, but the terms demanded by the Secretary are so onerous that only the State of Arizona has agreed to them in order to keep the Grand Canyon open.

Actually, this is a hot-button issue, Mr. Speaker. The President of the United States and the Secretary of the Interior are going around talking about closing the park. There is no park closing bill, and I would urge this body to override the veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the override of the President's veto message on this important Interior appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, this bill, under the mantra of repeating over and over again a balanced budget amendment, something we would all like to do, but the question is how you do it, when you look into the bowels of what is in this particular bill and what is in the 7-year plan that our Republican colleagues are trying to foist upon us, they are extreme positions. They are positions that do not agree with the last three decades of work that has been done in this Congress, that is the product of the American people, the product I wish I could claim of only Democrats, but I know that there are many Republicans that have worked on that. But fundamentally it is in disagreement with the people of this country.

In this spending bill, I think we see in clear view the fact that this extreme agenda that is being delivered to this Congress by the leadership in this House and the Republican Senate is inherent. They are trying to put in here in a covert way, the chairman of the policy committee rises and gives a speech, but the fact is the policy committees have not done their work.

This is a spending bill, but yet within this spending bill, it is laced with provisions that overturn fundamental policies of environmental law, of land use law, of the endangered species, very well worked out agreements such as the Tongass Forest agreement which now they disagree with. This fact is they are trying to put it through in a covert way.

If these proposals are so meritorious, why are they not put up on the floor to be voted on and considered as they were passed into law initially, in other words, to defund something that has been designated a park? That is what is done in this particular legislation, in other words, to renege on the establishment of the Mojave National Preserve in California, to open up again the question of the Tongass which has an agreement to cut 300 million board-feet a year, but to specify and to suggest to override all environmental types of challenges that exist in law for good reason; for good reason, to renege on the Columbia Basin and prevent the establishment of an environmental impact statement so that we can move forward with the Pacific Northwest problem.

This bill deserves to be defeated, and I hope we will uphold the President's veto.

□ 1145

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], a member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, let us stop the rhetoric, misstatements, and half-truths. The current budget crisis this Nation is facing is not because Congress failed to do its job. We passed a bill. It is because the President chose to veto the Interior appropriations bill, the VA, HUD and independent agencies appropriations bill, and the Commerce, Justice, State bill, and because Democratic Senators are filibustering the Labor, HHS bill.

Again, let me reiterate why certain Federal employees have been furloughed and why others are performing their duties without pay; it is because the President has decided that it is more important for him to engage in partisan politics than to allow Federal employees to go back to work.

Today, we are going to have the opportunity to override the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. If we are successful, this $12.1 billion appropriations measure will reopen our museums, the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, put back to work those dedicated employees at the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as get the needed money to our Nation's Indian communities.

The President's shutdown of the Federal Government does not have to continue. In fact, if you want to find out what kind of impact his shutdown is having, I would encourage all of my colleagues to visit one of the 23 tribal communities in Arizona. They have been devastated by the President's veto of this important bill. Recently, the proud and noble Chairman of the Hopi Tribe announced that he may have to release the inmates in the tribe's jail

because they do not have the money to heat the facility. I might add that these funds are included in this Interior appropriations bill. Again, we do not have to allow this type of suffering to continue.

The President's veto message was based solely upon polls conducted by his political advisers. The President realized that most Americans are concerned about the environment, and justifiably so. But he has taken this posturing to an extreme and in the process hundreds of thousands of hard working Americans are suffering the consequences.

I will speak more about this later. Let us do what all Americans want us to do: Let us allow them to go back to work. Overriding the President's veto of this bill will accomplish this and a lot more.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, there are more than sufficient reasons for both the President's veto and for our sustaining it.

But I think it is especially important to explain why this is not about reopening the part of Government funded in this bill. The illogic of the arguments that have been offered on this point is profound, if not comic. Here is how it goes.

First, let us dillydally for months on even getting this bill to the floor of the House of Representatives, having wasted months and months on extraneous business at the first part of the first session of this Congress. That is what happened on this bill.

Second, then let us yield control of much of the substance of the bill in conference to some of the most extreme anti-environmental forces and have it rejected, not once but twice, taking additional weeks, not because of the President of the United States but because moderate Members of the majority party could not swallow the fiscal and environmental outrages in this bill. That is what happened.

Third, then let us waste several more weeks before finally getting a bill to the House that could pass. That is what happened on this bill.

And, fourth, we then end up 2½ months into the fiscal year, 2½ months late, 2½ months of irresponsible failure by the majority party to manage the most basic business of the Congress. That is what happened on this bill.

Fifth, we then wait another month after that, 3½ months into the fiscal year, 3½ months late, 3½ months of failure by the majority to manage the business of the House, and then we bring up a veto override and have the temerity to suggest that it is the President's fault for the circumstances that we are in? Give me a break.

An absolutely astounding, stunning act of political chutzpah, to suggest that having failed in our responsibilities for 3½ months to take care of the people of America, funding critical natural resource management responsibility, then to suggest that it is the President's fault, that he is somehow responsible for these unfortunate circumstances. It makes no sense. Truly an amazing act of political illogic.

This partial closure is in fact the intended effect of the Speaker's deliberate decision cynically to use the majority's failure to get its work done on appropriations bills to leverage concessions on other budget matters on which the American public and their President simply disagree with the extreme views of many in the majority party.

We are in this fix because of the Speaker's refusal and no other reason.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to override the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. For 20 days now, his veto shut the American people out of the Smithsonian Museums, the national parks such as the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, and in my district the Cleveland National Forest. These parks and museums provide a quality of outdoor life and experience for millions of Americans.

I commend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman, and certainly there is no other chairman that I know of that would write a more fair and equitable bill than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the chairman. I commend him for his hard work in crafting this spending bill for our Nation's national parks, national forests, public lands, and national wildlife refuges during these times of budget constraints. The Interior appropriations bill provides similar operating funds as in 1995, as we did previously, for national parks and monuments.

We will later today take up legislation to allow State employees to voluntarily operate our national parks. I also support this legislation. But this bill, overriding the President's veto, is the much better long-range solution to the problem.

One hundred thirty thousand Federal employees are furloughed because of the President's veto of this bill. These people deserve to be back to work, allowing our national parks and forests and cultural institutions to be open.

I urge my colleagues to override the President's veto and support this bill.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] has offered a motion to discharge from committee the Interior appropriations bill that has been vetoed by the President. Normally the committee would go to work, take into consideration the reasons the President gave for his veto, reasonable policymakers would make the necessary adjustments, and pass the appropriation.

Now the Republicans are trying to find a way to look better. They have simply created a mess, not only on this bill but on the budget in general. The Republican caucus has been led by the freshman class, that group which has the least experience in the management of government.

The Republicans have gone too far. The Republicans have stepped way over the line. They have jeopardized not only the National Park Service in this bill, they have jeopardized Federal employees and veterans' services, prison security, passport services, and Social Security services.

Time and time again we heard that they were willing to shut this Government down, that they would do this, and this is what they are doing. Just yesterday they voted in the Committee on Rules to allow the Speaker to recess in 3-day intervals. They are planning to go home. In that Committee on Rules, GERALD SOLOMON, JAMES QUILLEN, DAVID DREIER, PORTER GOSS, JOHN LINDER, DEBORAH PRYCE, LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, SCOTT MCINNIS, and ENID WALDHOLTZ all voted to give the Speaker the power to call a recess.

I urge my colleagues to sustain the President's veto. This is not about good policymaking. This is about the continued efforts to force all of us to do what that freshman class wants done. We cannot allow that to happen. I think we are more responsible than that.

And if they decide to recess, let them go home. But the people on this side of the aisle, my colleagues in the Democratic Party, I believe, will stay here. We will stay here and do the work of the people rather than use those kinds of tactics.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

(Mr. BOEHLERT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this effort to override the President's veto. In doing so, I must acknowledge that I agree with the President on one thing: This bill is not perfect. But guess what? The legislative process is not about producing legislation that one side or another views as perfect. The legislative process is about getting the most reasonable compromise possible among competing viewpoints.

We need to remember the old adage, ''The perfect is the enemy of the good.'' This bill represents a reasonable compromise.

Take the issue of the Tongass National Forest on which I worked. This bill would allow the planning process

to continue unimpeded. This bill would allow science to determine the acreage and the allowable sale quantity that will eventually be permitted in the forest. This bill allows for the set-aside of additional environmentally sensitive habitat conservation areas. And this bill would allow lawsuits to challenge the controversial alternative P forest management plan.

Did we make some compromises to achieve these goals? Of course we did. We made reasonable compromises with legislators with opposing views to protect the long-run health of the forests and the integrity of the planning process.

Let me repeat that. We made reasonable compromises with legislators with opposing views to protect the long-range health of the forests and the integrity of the planning process.

I urge an override.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I just want to say, in response to the gentlewoman from California, that we have been negotiating with the administration on a continuous basis. Some of the changes were in response to their requests. The only problem is they kept moving the goal posts.

I thought it was interesting that it took them 6 hours after they vetoed the bill to decide what the veto message would say, because I think they had some problems. They recognized it was a good bill, and yet they felt that they had a commitment to close the parks and close the forests and close the Smithsonian and close the Holocaust and close the National Gallery of Art. And so, after finally pondering as to why they did veto the bill, we got a veto message late in the day.

I say to my colleagues that are wondering procedurally, we are not going to call for a vote on this motion to discharge the bill from the appropriations process, and we will go into the next hour of debate on the override itself. But I hope at that time the 89 Members of the minority party that voted to override the President for the securities lawyers will vote to override the President for the people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION STATUS TO BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment—most-favored-nation treatment—to the products of Bulgaria, with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment, the Dole proposal to open the Government, and that a motion to reconsider be considered as laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers and recorded on page 534 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–147)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the veto message of the President of the United States on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1200

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of debate on this subject. I have a number of Members that would like to speak on it, so I will reserve my remarks for the closing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to urge my colleagues to support the motion to override. For the sake of the American people we need to reopen our national treasures. There is no good reason why the parks are closed. There is no good reason why the monuments are closed. There is no reason why our constituents here in Washington cannot go to some of the great places around this District.

This bill is fair, balanced. It protects our natural resources while ensuring a fair return to the American taxpayers. I urge all my colleagues to support the motion to override.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

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

I also thank the chair of the committee who does outstanding work and is an outstanding chair, but I must rise to urge that we not override the veto.

The veto is there because the President found that there were things in this bill that were broken, that need fixing, and we in Congress can fix those things. The President rejected the clear-cutting of the Tongass National Forest. The President rejected the jeopardizing of the Columbia River Basin ecosystem management plan. The President recognized that this bill kills the California Desert Protection Act that Congress enacted last year.

This bill prohibits the protection of the habitat for endangered species and further prohibits any further listing of endangered species. This bill walks away from the commitment of the Indian Health Service and Indian education. It walks away from the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities. In particular let us talk about that for a moment.

I think the shutdown of the Federal Government has drawn national attention to the importance that the arts play particularly here in Washington, DC. Indeed our country has said that these things are important. This bill cuts funding for those important programs. This bill was vetoed because Congress failed to hear the recommendations of the White House conference on tourism which met here just a few months ago, the private sector, at the invitation of the President, to recommend to Congress and to the executive department of how we should best support tourism in the United States. This bill undermines those recommendations.

So my colleagues, this committee has worked hard. It has an outstanding chair and outstanding members because it has recognized the interest of special interests in this and is certainly a bill that ought to be vetoed, as it was by the President. I ask my colleagues to sustain that veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to be a staunch environmentalist. I opposed this bill in some earlier versions. In fact, Members may recall that this is the third try which finally managed to get past the House. I voted against it the first two times because I was concerned about environmental issues. But I am satisfied that this bill in its present form is the best bill we are going to get out of the House. I believe that the environmentalist concerns are largely satisfied.

In regard to the National Endowment for the Humanities, I was also one of those who worked to maintain funding for the National Endowment for the Humanities. In fact, we managed to get

it increased considerably over some of the earlier proposals.

Once again, I believe this is the best bill that we can get from this House as it relates to funding for that organization. I read the veto message from the President, and to me it seems like a rather thin veto message. I suspect if this bill had hit his desk by itself and not in the company of the other two bills he vetoed the same day, this bill would have been signed and passed into law because the objections are not that strong.

I believe it is very important that we vote to override the President's veto on this bill. It is important that we open our national parks, our wildlife refuges, our national forests, put 130,000 Federal employees back to work, open our museums and the Smithsonian in particular do a good service to the American public by once again allowing them to use and visit these national treasures which we have.

I urge my colleagues, particularly those on the other side of the aisle, who are concerned about these issues to recognize that this bill in its present form is a good bill, certainly the best we are likely to get through this Congress, and I urge them to override the President's veto and put this into effect.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to sustain President Clinton's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. The legislative riders in H.R. 1977 mandate extreme changes in national environmental policy that cannot stand public scrutiny on their own. Otherwise, they would not be hidden in this funding bill.

One of the riders in H.R. 1977 would end a hugely successful energy-efficiency program that was enacted 8 years ago during the Reagan administration. At that time, a broad industry coalition that included all major appliance manufacturers agreed to efficiency standards to make refrigerators, washing machines, air conditioners, dishwashers, and gas furnaces more efficient. On average, these Federal efficiency standards have brought savings of $1,300 per U.S. household—a total of $130 billion in economic savings.

Why would Congress terminate a program that has brought such great savings to our constituents and dramatically reduced emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases that contribute to global warming? It is not because global warming is not a problem. Today's New York Times reports that last year was the warmest year since records were first kept in 1856; and that the years 1991 through 1995 were warmer than any similar 5-year period on record. Why would we raise the cost of energy to our constituents to allow for greater pollution of their environment and an increase in global warming?

Innovative companies like Whirlpool, Frigidaire, and Maytag support the Federal efficiency standards and are developing new technologies that lead to more efficient appliances. Unfortunately, other companies have not stepped up to the challenge and now want Congress to reward their poor performance.

This rider brushes aside consumer interests, technological innovation, and environmental protection to please a select group of companies who have lobbied for a special interest gift. The winners are the whiners—the least efficient companies, the ones that pollute the most. The losers, again, are our constituents who are being threatened with policies they do not support that would deplete our natural resources and bring great harm to our environment.

This is awful policy, and it should be deleted from this bill. Support the President's veto.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1996]

'95 THE HOTTEST YEAR ON RECORD AS THE GLOBAL TREND KEEPS UP

(By William K. Stevens)

The earth's average surface temperature climbed to a record high last year, according to preliminary figures, bolstering scientists' sense that the burning of fossil fuels is warming the climate.

Spells of cold, snow and ice like the ones this winter in the northeastern United States come and go in one region or another, as do periods of unusual warmth. But the net result globally made 1995 the warmest year since records first were kept in 1856, says a provisional report issued by the British Meteorological Office and the University of East Anglia.

The average temperature was 58.72 degrees Fahrenheit, according to the British data, seven-hundredths of a degree higher than the previous record, established in 1990.

The British figures, based on land and sea measurements around the world, are one of two sets of long-term data by which surface temperature trends are being tracked.

The other, maintained by the NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies in New York, shows the average 1995 temperature at 59.7 degrees, slightly ahead of 1990 as the warmest year since record-keeping began in 1866. But the difference is within the margin of sampling error, and the two years essentially finished neck and neck.

The preliminary Goddard figures differ from the British ones because they are based on a somewhat different combination of surface temperature observations around the world.

One year does not a trend make, but the British figures show the years 1991 through 1995 to be warmer than any similar five-year period, including the two half-decades of the 1980's, the warmest decade on record.

This is so even though a sun-reflecting haze cast aloft by the 1991 eruption of Mount Pinatubo in the Philippines cooled the earth substantially for about two years. Despite the post-Pinatubo cooling, the Goddard data show the early 1990's to have been nearly as warm as the late 1980's, which Goddard says was the warmest half-decade on record.

Dr. James E. Hansen, the director of the Goddard center, predicted last year that a new global record would be reached before 2000, and yesterday he said he now expected that ''we will still get at least a couple more'' by then.

Dr. Hansen has been one of only a few scientists to maintain steadfastly that a century-long global warming trend is being caused by mostly by human influence, a belief he reiterated yesterday.

Other experts would go no further than the recent findings of a United Nations panel of scientists in attributing the continuing and accelerating warming trend to human activity—specifically the emission of heat-trapping gases like carbon dioxide, which is released by the burning of coal, petroleum products and wood.

The United Nations panel concluded, for the first time, that the observed warming is ''unlikely to be entirely natural in origin'' and that the evidence ''suggests a discernible human influence on climate.''

Previously, few scientists apart from Dr. Hansen had been willing to go even that far, contending that the relatively small warming so far could easily be a result of natural climate variability. Even now, most experts say it is unclear whether human activity is responsible for a little of the warming or a lot.

''I think we're beginning to see it,'' Dr. Phil Jones of the Climatic Research Unit at East Anglia said of the human influence on climate, adding that he agreed with the United Nations report.

''I don't think you can say much from one year's values,'' he said, ''but this figure from '91 to '95 is quite illuminating.'' He said it was nearly half a degree above the 1961–90 benchmark average of 58 degrees.

Both the 1995 record high temperature and the strikingly warm half-decade of the early 1990's are ''consistent with the sort of expectation we have of the interplay between natural and manmade influences.'' said Dr. Tom M.L. Wigley of the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colo. If things had not turned out that way, he said, ''we would have been pretty surprised and maybe a little concerned'' about the United Nations panel's conclusion. Nevertheless, he said, ''it's not the sort of thing you want to overinterpret or overemphasize.''

Dr. Wigley was a member of a subcommittee of the United Nations panel that dealt specifically with the question of detecting a human role in climate change.

The panel predicted that the heat-trapping gas emissions would cause the average global temperature, now approaching 60 degrees Fahrenheit, to rise by a further 1.8 to 6.3 degrees, with a best estimate of 3.6 degrees, by 2100.

By comparison the world is 5 to 9 degrees warmer now than in the last ice age more than 10,000 years ago. The predicted warming, if it materializes, would likely cause widespread climatic disruption, the United Nations panel said.

The margin of seven-hundredths of a degree by which the 1995 global average exceeds that of 1990, according to the new British data, sounds small. But it represents an increase of nearly half a degree from the post Pinatubo low, in 1992. As scientists had previously predicted, the recovery from the Pinatubo cooling became obvious last year, though no record was set.

The 1995 figure is all the more remarkable, Dr. Hansen said, because it was established at a time when two natural warming influences were neutralized. The solar energy cycle was at a low ebb, and the warming effect of El Niño, the pool of warm Pacific water that appeared in early 1995, was offset by a turn to cooler-than-normal conditions in the tropical Pacific later in the year.

A different picture emerges from an analysis of satellite measurements of global temperature by Dr. John R. Christy of the University of Alabama and Dr. Roy Spencer of NASA's Marshall Space Flight Center in Hunstville, Ala. While their data show temperature fluctuations roughly paralleling

those in the surface measurements, the values are lower: 1995 was only an ordinary year compared with the data set's 1982–91 average.

But that was a warm period to start with, said Dr. Christy. And, Dr. Jones said, the satellite measurements combine temperature readings for the entire lower atmosphere, rather than measuring just at the surface, while the most prominent warming—over the Northern Hemisphere continents—does not extend very far upward. That explanation of the difference in the data sets ''makes sense,'' Dr. Christy said, adding, ''Of course we only live in the bottom'' of the atmosphere.

In the past, skeptics about global warming have cited the satellite data. But Dr. Christy said that even the rate of warming measured from the satellites has begun to move into the range scientists expect to result from human-caused warming.

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

Mr. WAXMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for this, his observation. There are many things, all these riders do not belong in a spending bill. This is not just about spending. It is about bad policy and it is about bad priorities in this bill.

In fact, the veto of this bill was not even a close call, I would not think, of the President. What has happened here is we have had Republicans in the House and Senate, after 14 months, agreeing with themselves and not making any effort or not a substantial enough of an effort to in fact come to resolution on these issues which have been 30 years of environmental policy by both Democrats and Republicans, Presidents and Congresses.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], an excellent member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier I spoke about the importance of overriding the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill. I want to take a couple of minutes to talk about some of the negotiations that went on with this administration, because I think it is an important illustration of the problem we are facing on the entire budget.

Back in September, before these bills had finished their work in the House and the Senate, there was a discussion between staff and between the chairmen with the administration about some of their key funding priorities. Here is what they said about some of them. Here is what the conference did.

On the Bureau of Indian Affairs, something that affects my State tremendously, the administration said they needed a minimum of $110 million more, and we ended up giving $135 million more, $111 to the Senate level for the BIA and we added $25 million to the Indian Health Service. So we added more than the administration said was necessary in order to meet their objections to that.

In the Department of Energy, this is a department where the administration's idea of conservation is chartering jets for Hazel O'Leary to fly to South Africa, in the Department of Energy they said the Energy Information Administration needed to be much closer to the House funding level. We added $7.5 million. We split the difference between the Senate and the House. It is a compromise which all appropriation bills represent, as they have in the past, as they do this year.

In the Forest Service they said they needed to increase the stewardship incentive program to double the Senate level. We did not double the Senate level. But we provided $4.5 million, whereas the House had not originally provided that.

Then some of the key legislative appropriation items, they said they needed to have the House mining patent moratorium. Yes, we went back and forth on that and twice in this House took this issue to the floor here. But it is in there. So it is an item that the President said that he needed to have in there. Tongass, I will not discuss that. It has been discussed enough here on the floor. It is a compromise between the two positions.

The California Desert, the administration said they needed to have the National Park Service in charge, that the House language would not work. We modified the language so that the park service can use planning and use of seasonal employees. The Bureau of Land Management will operate it in its coming fiscal year while they are developing the plan for management of it.

The administration said they needed Senate language on AmeriCorps, and it has the Senate language on AmeriCorps. The administration said it needed to have the grazing reform moratorium for a maximum of 90 days and it retains the moratorium for a maximum of 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one that we can support. It is one that represents a compromise between the interests. It is one that represents an opportunity to fund the vital agencies of this Government, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes, to put Federal employees back to work, to open the national parks.

Let me take my remaining time to say one word about the issue that has been raised about Mount Graham because there too is a good example of the kind of back and forth that this administration has done over the last 6 years. For last 6 years the Justice Department of three administrations has defended the position of this Congress and of the administration to build those telescopes on Mount Graham in a way that protected the red squirrel and allowed science to go forward. To say no now to that after we had passed it and made it very clear that that is what we intended to do is to say no simultaneously to protecting the squirrel, to protecting the environment, to the endangered species and to say no to good science. That is the kind of thing that we have seen here today, the kind of hypocrisy that we have heard about.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

(Mr. COLEMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans just do not get it. They do not get it. They do not understand. Some of us served in the majority under Republican Presidents and when a bill was vetoed because the President, by the way, has that authority in the Constitution of the United States, they are not the President, the majority is not the President, the majority does not run the whole country, believe it or not, I know that is hard to accept, especially by their freshman Republicans, but I have got to tell them something. When the President vetoes a bill, what we try to do is work out what it is that we need to do in order to see to it that the President can sign the bill. We negotiate.

Instead what they have taken the position of doing is saying, it is our way or no way. So let us not do this hype business about the reason that parks are closed is because the President vetoes a bill. Some of us have served in the majority under Republican Presidents who have had to deal with vetoed legislation. We did not shut the Government down for 3 weeks like Republicans are about to do. Is it not about 21 days? I think so, 19 or 20. So I just say to my colleagues, try to understand the process. It is called the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH]

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am a Republican freshman and I am very proud of it. I made a decision recently to not pass continuing resolutions until we got the President to deal realistically about a balanced budget scored in 7 years.

However, upon that decision, that led to the closure of Yosemite National Park in my district. Not only do my Federal employees suffer, but also the communities of Mariposa, Oakhurst, Coarsegold, Three Rivers, and Auberry. Private property owners, private businessmen who are not being, who will not be repaid, one motel owner Jerry Fisher has lost a quarter of a million dollars so far.

I am proud of what I am doing and what I stand for. My community is suffering. I ask my colleagues to override this veto. This is a reasonable bill. It is a fair compromise. It should not be used as a pawn in this game. I want this bill overridden.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, there are policy reasons why this bill should be rejected, serious and substantial policy reasons. There are three basic broad reasons.

First, this is a bill that is unacceptable because it would unduly restrict our ability to protect our natural resources and our cultural heritage. The second reason this bill does not promote the technology that we need for long-term energy conservation and economic growth.

Third, the one perhaps most important to me and many others that have native American populations in their States, is that this bill seriously undermines our commitment to provide adequate health, educational and other services to native Americans.

Let me also talk about the Tongass. I have been to the Tongass. Just because you may represent that area does not mean that you have all the wisdom of that area. In the Tongass, this bill would allow harmful clear-cutting, require the sale of timber at unsustainable levels. And it would dictate the need for an outdated forest plan for the next fiscal year.

In the Columbia River basin, the bill would impede implementation of a comprehensive plan. The result, gridlock, court challenges on timber harvesting, grazing, mining and other important activities.

In the California Desert, the bill undermines our designation of the Mojave National Preserve by cutting funding for the preserve and shifting responsibility for its management from the Park Service to the BLM. The bill would also put a misguided moratorium on future listings and critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act. The bill slashes funding for DOE's energy conservation program so our commitment to energy conservation and renewable energy once again is suspect.

Native Americans perhaps are hit the worst than anybody. If you look at the effect of the shutdown, it is native Americans that are suffering the most. This bill would make it worse. Funding for Indian Health Service totally inadequate, Indian education programs, cuts at BIA programs that are important for child welfare, adult vocational training, law enforcement, detention services, community fire protection and general assistance to low income Indian individuals and families.

□ 1215

Moreover, the bill would unfairly single out certain self-governance tribes in Washington State for punitive treatment. Specifically, it would penalize these tribes financially for using legal remedies in disputes with non-tribal owners of land within reservations.

Finally, the bill represents a dramatic departure from our commitment to support for the arts and humanities. It cuts funding of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities so deeply as to jeopardize their capacity to keep providing the cultural, educational, and artistic programs that enrich America's communities large and small.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen poll after poll say that the American people care about the environment, and hopefully there are moderate forces on that side, on the majority side, that will see that and are seeing that, and I acknowledge several Members from midwestern, from eastern States that recognize that there is no reason why we should not keep our commitments to the environment.

There is no reason to sign bad bills. The President constitutionally can veto bad policy bills, and the argument just does not wash that, if we just sign this bill, everyone will go back to work at the national parks or the BLM. There are no good reasons to sign this bill.

I come from a Western State, and I realize many of my colleagues on that side will disagree. This is a bad bill for Western States that want quality of life, that want to have balance on timber harvesting and mining and grazing.

I urge rejection of this bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for yielding this time to me.

I would like to respond to the last couple of speakers. One a couple a speakers ago said Republicans do not get it. I would hope that we, and, as my colleagues know, this place is inherently political, so we are going to talk about politics here, and politics enters into the veins of what goes on in this House, but I do not see this Interior bill as a political issue. I see this Interior bill as an issue to get the Nation back to work, to open up the Park Service, to talk about legitimate policy differences, and it is my understanding that basically we worked out the policy differences before the bill left the House floor. There was a great deal of discussion on this for a period of many weeks, so I think we solved those problems, and, as a representative of the State of Maryland, I think the Interior bill is not a perfect bill, it is not an excellent bill. It is a moderate approach to solve the problems of the Federal lands, and I think it should be voted on, and I think we should override the Presidential veto.

On a couple of the policy differences, restricting our natural resources with this bill I do not think is correct. I think this bill goes a long way in enhancing the policies to improve the natural resources of the United States. It is not perfect, but there is no utopia.

Let us move in the right direction. This did not take a huge step in the right direction, but it did take a couple of steps in the right direction. We continue to work on this to promote technology for conservation. I think we have shifted in the right direction.

One of the things this country can do, this Government can do, to enhance conservation is to enhance the environment conducive in the private sector to look for the technology to do that. We cannot do everything here in Government.

Native Americans. We increased the amount of money from what the President wanted. Now, if we look at native Americans and we look at reservations today, I think we are improving the quality of life for native Americans.

I want to say something quick about Tongass. The President did not like the fact that there could not be legal challenges. We changed that. We moderated that.

The President did not like the fact that we were not going to protect goshawks, we did not have conservation areas. We changed that. We now have those changes.

There is a lot of discussion about how is there going to be clear-cutting. There is nothing in the bill that states there is going to be clear-cutting, and the Forest Service manages the way the trees are going to be cut, and I trust this Interior Department so that there will not be clear-cutting.

I think we ought to override the President's veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST]. I know that he is a reasonable person and that he goes into these issues very carefully. I think he has come to the wrong conclusion if he believes that the environmental deficits of this bill have been settled. If it were true, that there were no environmental flaws and big environmental flaws in this bill, why then would the Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, Nature Conservancy, the Wilderness Society, Defenders of Wildlife all be opposed to this bill?

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

(Mr. ABERCROMBIE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding this time to me, and the reason that I asked for the time was to reply to the rather astounding claim for preferential treatment by the gentleman from California representing the area around Yosemite National Park, Mariposa County, and adjoining counties. I fail to understand how the gentleman can come to the well of the House and say that he is proud to be a Republican freshman who is going to impose or try to impose his ideology over the welfare of the general citizenry and at the same time ask us now to override the President's veto because people in his district are hurting, because business in his district is hurting.

I think I can speak about tourism at least as well as the gentleman from California, having represented the No. 1 tourist destination area in the world for more time in more legislative

venues than anybody in this Congress. When we cannot issue visas, we cannot get people to come to this country, let alone to Hawaii to be able to help with our balance of trade deficit. Tourism is the positive force in that area, and yet someone can come here to the floor and say, ''Your people stay out or work, but put my people back to work,'' and then claim some kind of moral high ground in a political debate about being proud to shut the country down, standing up for the principle of I want mine, but my colleagues do not get theirs?

Some people have come into this Congress happy that they have never had any legislative experience, citing that as some kind of virtue. I think that kind of claim is so blatantly exposed with that kind of rhetoric to come here on the floor and say, ''I want mine. I don't want to take responsibility for what I'm doing to the rest of the people of this country, but help me out because I have got a political problem.''

I say to my colleagues, ''Shame on you, grow up, learn what a legislature is all about.''

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], an excellent member of our subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to strongly support overriding this Presidential veto that the President has signed recently on this particular bill that affects so many people in the Department of Interior.

As my colleagues know, we have heard a lot of talk about putting Federal workers back to work, Mr. Speaker, in the Department of Interior and agencies that come under the Department of Interior, and I am all for that. I think it is time that we do that, but I think we have to understand that the President of the United States, in the stroke of his veto pen, sealed the fate of Federal workers, but he also sealed the fate of non-Federal workers who rely on the forests for their livelihood.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] and a lot of Democrats and Republicans worked very heard to present a bill to the President that would be acceptable, and I heard the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] say earlier today that the goalpost had moved, and they consistently moved during the negotiation period. That is true. We made a special effort to talk to the President, talk to the Interior Department and get a bill that would be acceptable to everybody, and we sent it down to the White House, and the President, as I say, as my colleagues know, boldly strokes his veto pen and seals the fate of people in the Department of Interior and people out of the Department of Interior, and, so I say, he sealed the fate of non-Federal workers in our Nation's forests who have been devastated by the no-harvest policy of this administration, and that is the crime here, is that the President in vetoing this bill not only hurts people who are Federal workers, but he hurts people who are non-Federal workers who rely on the forest for jobs.

In addition I have to ask the question of my friends on the other side, ''Who is thinking about the jobs of the people who are non-Federal employees?'' Anyone who votes to override this veto will think about and will support jobs in the private sector that would come about by this signing, overriding this bill, and also the people in the public sector, and I urge my colleagues to vote to override this veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, the President was wise in vetoing this bill. This is terrible energy policy, terrible environmental policy. It is an all-out assault upon the environment in our country. We can go down the litany from Tongass to California Desert, through all of the parks decisions which are made under the guise of an appropriations bill, but there is a 50 percent cut in money for low income weatherization, thousands, thousands of poor and elderly across this country dependent upon this money—cut 50 percent for the poor in this appropriations bill. The energy efficiency standards that were put on the books in 1987, 1989, 1991, which have improved the efficiency of stoves, of refrigerators, and people say, ''Who cares?'' I will tell my colleagues who cares. Because of those laws we have saved 4 billion barrels of oil from having to be imported in the United States from Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, 4 billion in the last 8 years. We saved the need for us to build 50 500-megawatt nuclear power plants in this country. We saved consumers in this country $132 billion in electricity costs, untold billions of dollars in nuclear power plants that would have had to have been constructed, and they say, well, this is just a small compromise. No new energy standards for any refrigerator, or stove, or light bulb, when we know the gains that are made by working smarter and not harder in environment, in energy efficiency in energy.

This is terrible policy. It is a direct assault upon the environment of this country. This bill must be vetoed, the veto must be sustained, if we are to have an environment in this country that is worth respecting.

Please, instead of having the EPA turn into every polluter's ally, support the President and sustain the veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to override the President's veto. While it is true that the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriation bill does not provide for the same level of funding we have seen in previous years, it does provide funding for such important functions as management of our Nation's parks and refuges which, I think, is very, very important. The American people want a balanced budget, and all areas of the Government must contribute toward this goal, and they want their parks and refuges open. As long as the President's veto is able to stand, our Nation's treasured 369 parks and 504 refuges will remain closed, and the people who we hire to manage them will be out of work.

□ 1230

These parks and refuges are funded by millions of American taxpayers' dollars who paid for them with entrance fees, excise taxes, duck stamps and income tax payments. It is unfair for the American people to continue to be shut out of these lands.

No bill is perfect. Would I write this one differently? Yes, I would. But it does achieve two primary goals: It provides funding to maintain the park and refuge system, and it moves us toward the all-important goal of a balanced budget.

I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' so Americans can once again have access to the parks and refuges for which they have paid.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to override the President's veto. The fact is that this, as I said earlier, is not a close call. I understand, and I think most Members understand, there is a new majority in this House. We understand there is not enough money in the Park Service or the BLM or the Forest Service, and some of that I guess I do not like. They are not my priorities, if that was all that this bill did in terms of changing funding, if it did not target things like the Low-Income Energy Assistance Program for the poor.

I, as a Representative, feel a special obligation to defend and represent the powerless in our society, not the powerful, the special interests. But this bill goes way beyond that.

We have heard a litany of suggestions about the fact that if we do not pass an appropriations bill, the parks cannot open up, the refuges cannot function, the Smithsonian remains closed. That is because, of course, the majority in this body will not take up the Dole resolution which, in fact, would provide a CR, which is the normal course of what has been done year in and year out with few exceptions. This is unprecedented, to be in the 20th day of a shutdown without appropriations.

The fact of the matter is that this is a sham, the suggestion you could pass this and the parks would be open, because we know that at the end of this month, the debt ceiling is going to have to be addressed, that issue is

going to have to be addressed, and then not just the Park Service, but everything, the advocacy here; and make no mistake about it, I understand it and you understand it.

You know what the scheme has been since last year when the Speaker announced that he would bring the Government to a halt to get what he wants in terms of issues.

Now, I do not think that there is anything wrong with a balanced budget. I commend you for the emphasis and effort and impetus that has been brought to that particular issue. I commend Ross Perot for the impetus that has been brought to that. But the fact is that a balanced budget and the good things here with parks and others that you want to hold up as a shield to deflect the bad policy that lies behind it is where the concern comes.

You have to compromise. You have to address those issues. You cannot step back and suggest that we want a balanced budget; everyone wants that. I would just like to mention to my friends, you are not the first that have been here with a plan for a balanced budget in 4 years or 5 years or make it 7 years. Intuition? I think not. I think, more, political motivation to justify getting reelected. But it is a tough goal to accomplish.

You cannot justify a balanced budget with bad policy. Good environmental policy will, in fact, lend itself to achieving that particular balanced budget. But you cannot pour more money into the southeast part of Alaska for building roads and losing money on timber and all of the other natural resources that you have in here; in other words, in the Pacific Northwest, reneging on the Columbia Basin.

Mr. Speaker, science to this group seems to be very selective. Everybody wants to have more science, but science seems to this new majority to be what the Inquisition was to religion. You just cannot selectively use that. If you wore this bill out in public, you would be arrested for indecent exposure.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida [Mrs. FOWLER].

(Mrs. FOWLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FOWLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this vote override. We need to reopen our national parks, wildlife refuges, museums, and monuments.

The fiscal year 1996 appropriations bill for the Department of the Interior was vetoed by the President on December 18. Had it been signed into law—along with the many other appropriations bills that the President has chosen to veto—our precious national parks would be open today. Park guides and wildlife managers would be at work as we speak. Children would be touring our national museums on class trips and history would be relived for the many visitors to our national monuments.

Instead, these national treasures remain closed—not because of our inability to pass an appropriations bill, but because the President has refused to open them.

In my district, this means that the Timucuan National Preserve is closed to the countless visitors it enjoys on a daily basis. The Timucuan Preserve includes wetlands, forests, prehistoric archaeological sites, and historic sites. This veto means that the Fort Caroline National Memorial and Fort Matanzas National Park are unable to accommodate visitors and school children wishing to learn about the area's rich 16th century history. Further, the President's veto means that visitors to the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument, a historic fort in St. Augustine, are unable to actually enter that historic fort.

I urge my colleagues to support the override to open our national parks and send these Federal workers back to work.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that any of us can tolerate the misrepresentation of why the parks are closed down. The parks are closed down for one very simple reason. The Republicans have yet to receive their crown jewel in the Contract With America, which is a $245 billion tax break for the rich in America. You guys are holding up the whole Federal government in order to get that. Whether it be the parks or Medicare or student loans, you are going to hold your breath until you get that $245 billion to fulfill your contract with the country club in America.

Do not lay off the closing of the Federal parks on Bill Clinton. All he is saying is, open the parks, but do not expect me to cut Medicare and student loans and give a big tax break to the wealthy as the price for doing it. You can open the parks this afternoon if you want to, but you do not want to because you cannot as a result stop the Federal Government from operating in order to give your huge tax break for the corporate officials and country clubs across this country.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], a distinguished member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. SKEEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the louder the voice, the weaker the argument, and we have heard a lot of loud voices. But the basic thing that is wrong with this whole exercise is inconsistency. We are lobbing grenades at one another time after time over every minute issue in every bill, and this is another veto override that I think should happen.

There is nothing wrong with this bill, the Interior bill from an environmental standpoint, from a practicality standpoint; and just to illustrate to you that you should not cave in, Carlsbad Caverns was kept open because the local communities dug up the money with the State to keep it open.

If you want these people to go back to work in the Federal sector, override these vetoes and put them back to work.

As an illustration, and as an example, the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee bill passed. The Department of Agriculture is operating today. Every bureau, every system that has anything to do with agriculture is working today. If you also want to see an inconsistency, here is the IRS, one of our greatest examples of bureaucracy thievery, extracting from people who are on half-time withholding on income tax during this period of time. Another inconsistency.

Folks, I think it is about time we quit beating ourselves over the head and get down to the business of actually doing something definite about providing these bills and this legislation by overriding the foolish kind of a veto, to stop proposing foolish kinds of rhetoric and keep our voices down a little bit and have respect for one another.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I have the utmost respect for my good friend from New Mexico, but I insist that his was not a foolish veto by the President of the United States. There is a difference between a good bill and bad bill, and the President recognized that this was a bad bill. His veto was entirely justified, and in spite of all of the suggestions that the President ought to sign this bill and put people back to work, it still remains a bad bill, and his act in rejecting it was totally justified.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOGLIETTA].

(Mr. FOGLIETTA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution. The majority leader and the front-running candidate for the Republican nomination for President right: Enough is enough. It is time to put the government back in business again.

This override attempt is just public relations. This debate we have been having over the last month is, what is the Government supposed to do and who is it supposed to help?

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], my friend and the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, gave away just how the Republicans view this debate and how they view our government. That happened right after the President signed the Defense appropriations bill.

My dear friend, Mr. LIVINGSTON, said that the President has lost his negotiating edge because he and the Democrats were the only ones who had an interest in the constituencies involved in

the remaining appropriations bills. But that is so wrong.

The veterans who need health care are not Democrats; they are Americans who need our Government. The pregnant women and the mothers who need help getting a decent meal for their babies are not Democrats; they are Americans who need our Government. The people who count on the government to keep the environment clean are not Democrats; they are Americans. And the people who yearn to visit our historic sites, our national museums and national parks are not Democrats; they are Americans.

The President was right to veto this bill. It cuts too much and would hurt our environment. Let us bring the bill back and do it right.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity before us today to send 133,000 Federal employees back to work and at the same time reopen all of the national parks and museums of which we have heard so much about in recent weeks. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for this override.

A vote ''yes'' on the override will also provide welfare assistance to Indian children, keep Indian schools open and ensure essential services on Indian reservations. A vote ''yes'' will continue the mining patent moratorium and stop the giveaway of Federal lands.

The problem that we have is that this was indeed a carefully crafted piece of legislation that met demands from liberals and conservatives, Republicans and Democrats, on both sides of the Capitol; and despite the fact that it was returned to conference on many occasions, when it went to the President, he vetoed it.

Let me underscore that. He vetoed this bill, and the parks, the museums and all of the other good effects of this bill were shut down for the Christmas holidays. He kept 133,000 Federal employees from returning to work before Christmas. He has shut down the parks and the Smithsonian and the National Gallery which now I am glad to see has reopened. He is the one that told the native Americans that they cannot get welfare assistance for Indian children, funding for Indian schools. So what we are trying to do is simply fix the problem.

We have heard a lot of rhetoric on both sides. The time has come to put aside the rhetoric. The time has come to accept a good, a carefully crafted bill.

Understand, this is the best we can do. Override the President's veto. Send it back to him. Let us put these people back to work. Let us open the parks, be done with politics. We have already overridden his veto last week on a bill that was far less significant than this issue. This is a good bill.

I invite my friends on both sides of the aisle to override the President's veto and put these people back to work.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I think the point is that you can blame whomever you want. You can blame the House, you can blame the Senate or the President in terms of this measure. It has been around, and the fact that communication has not gone forward to resolve the differences is clear when we get a veto from the President.

□ 1245

So whatever the good intentions of my colleagues in trying to iron out the differences, they did not achieve it.

Nobody consulted me on this particular bill. I have worked on this. What is wrong with this is, this is a spending bill but nevertheless it has in it many, many policy provisions that should not be in a spending bill.

And some of the priorities of course in terms of spending, I understand my colleagues' difficulty, but there is no reason to suspend the reform efforts in terms of the roaded or unroaded areas in the West which are in this bill, to suspend the grazing reforms which are present in this bill. There is no reason to undo the Columbia Basin study areas and to put that science to use so it can serve us in these needs. There is no reason to address the policy issues.

These are measures that do not belong in a spending bill. These are the riders that are being put in here at the insistence of extreme individuals in the House and the Senate that do not belong in these particular bills and, often supported by various interest groups, they do not belong in here.

So you brought into this the fact that you do not want to bring these issues up on the floor and debate them in the normal process that is afforded the House and the Senate to consider these issues, so they are being jammed into this particular proposal. As I said, even if this bill were to pass and we could open it up, we would be right back to the same problem because of the debt ceiling, and you know that that debt ceiling is going to be used for the same purposes with the same goal.

You can wrap yourself in a balanced budget mantra all you want in terms of no matter how often you repeat it, but it is not going to happen. You cannot do that with bad policy. You cannot have a balanced budget, you cannot deal with the deficit if you are going to create an environmental deficit, and that is what is going on here.

Much of what has passed as legislative process this past year has been a direct assault, a covert assault, I might say, on the environment, but nevertheless having a devastating effect. That is why we need to reject this effort to override.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. BUNN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. BUNN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate with interest, and I have listened as we have been told that the parks are closed because of tax cuts, the parks are closed because of Medicare changes, the parks are closed because of veterans' issues.

Maybe I misunderstood, but I thought this was the Interior appropriations bill that we were talking about. I served on that committee and I worked, as we looked at an account-by-account basis, trying to make the changes, to set the priorities. We did save $1.4 billion in this as we moved toward balancing the budget.

I heard speaker after speaker talk about wanting to balance the budget on the other side. But we do not balance the budget unless we take action, and this budget does take action. It does preserve priorities, and it will get 133,000 people back to work if we will just vote to override.

We have the opportunity today to open the parks, to open the monuments, to open the museums, and stay on track to balancing the budget. It will not happen with talk. It will happen with action. This bill takes the action necessary.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARKEY].

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, the Government for 200 years stayed open when a President vetoed a bill. The Congress could sustain the veto, the Congress could override the veto, but the Government continued to work.

The only reason the Government is shut down is the Republicans have decided, after 200 years, they are going to use as a technique laying off hundreds of thousands of employees and the services that they provide for Americans, including their ability to walk into national parks across this country.

Why are we going to suspend that constitutional, historical, and successful way of governing this country? Because there is an emergency in this country, and the emergency is that the one thing the Republicans cannot do is get this $245 billion tax break for the wealthy in America. That is what the whole debate is over.

The bills which they are insisting upon the President passing include other parts of the Contract With America which include gutting of environmental laws. The historical mechanism by which we change environmental laws was through the appropriations process, by which you brought the EPA, Superfund, and the national parks laws out here separately. They do not want to do it that way. We are in emergency, martial law, to get that tax break for the wealthy. We will hold every ordinary Federal employee hostage. America held hostage to this tax

break for the wealthy. That is what it is all about.

We are going to gut environmental laws, we are going to cut Medicare, but we cannot keep the Government going. For 200 years, and, by the way, there are a lot of things that can be said about the Democratic Party, but for the 60 years we ran this place, the Government did not shut down. Once the Republicans get in charge, the whole thing comes down around their ears.

That is why we should sustain the President's veto and ensure that regular constitutional process is continued.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my friend from Massachusetts, this Government closed down nine times under the Reagan and Bush administrations when Congress did not come up with the appropriate resolutions and there was a veto and an impasse. The difference was in those days that it never lasted longer than 3 days or a weekend because the President would be up here after a veto trying to work out the differences. We have not seen that in this case.

I think our side is equally responsible. We ought to bring a continuing resolution and move it through, but I do not think you are blameless in this. Frankly, the President can end this right here by signing this bill.

The issues that you claim are policy issues are not enough money for weatherization, not enough money for the National Endowment for the Humanities, not enough for native Americans, but what is in this bill is a lot more than what you have got on the table right now, which is a Government shutdown altogether.

This bill will put 133,000 Federal workers back to work. It will open up our national parks. It will open up the U.S. Geological Survey, which is doing a lot of research on earthquakes, on health and safety, water quality assessment, that is not being done right now. We have to balance the good this bill does against a few of what I think are ideologically driven objections on the other side.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest over the course of the last several months to the passion with which the Republicans have attacked the welfare system of this country, talking time and time again about a system of dependency, a system which instead of breaking a cycle of poverty in fact maintains a cycle of poverty.

But it is interesting to me that when we talk about a different form of welfare, a welfare where taxpayers are robbed of their paychecks in order to pay huge subsidies to our mining companies, in order to pay huge subsidies to our timber companies, all of a sudden there is quiet on the Republican flank for that kind of welfare, that kind of dependency, that kind of denial of free market tactics. Why do we not stand and ask our lumber companies to really determine whether or not on their own, without taxpayer subsidies, they go into the Tongass?

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

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I will yield in one brief moment.

Why do we not ask whether foreign mineral companies would come and mine on our lands if in fact they had to pay the below-surface value of those mines rather than just the surface value of those mines?

What we have here is the denial of a real corporate kind of equity in America. We have a situation where we have welfare for the rich and free enterprise for the poor. That is the kind of system that the Republicans want to put upon the people of this country. It is time that we are consistent with what we expect the poor standards to be as well as what we expect the corporate standards to be in this country.

I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. REGULA. Is the gentleman aware there is a moratorium on issuing mining patents which is included in this bill?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am also aware that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] was very much involved in trying to get a better law, which he was not successful in convincing his fellow Republicans to do.

What you have essentially done is given them the keys to Fort Knox, you have given them the rights of Fort Knox, but you have not asked anybody to pay for the gold.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, let us put into perspective what seems to be one of the most contentious parts of the Interior appropriations bill, harvesting part of the Alaska Tongass Forest.

If this table represented Alaska, the Tongass Forest would represent a postage stamp. The area that we are talking about for harvesting would represent the size of a pinhead. Is this what the President and the Democratic Members of this body are willing to close down the Government about?

I lived in the Pacific Northwest for a number of years. There should be balance in weighing the benefits of logging versus the environment. This bill makes reasonable compromises in the use of this forest, and I respect Members such as the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], who are strong environmentalists and who support this bill. We should vote to override this veto.

Mr. Speaker, I want to respond to some of the rhetoric that has been on the floor this morning. The President's veto has more to do with politics than with the substance of this bill.

Now in the 20th day of current partial Government shutdown, the reason the national parks are closed is the direct result of bad faith bargaining by President Clinton. This ought to be crystal clear to all of the furloughed Government workers who are affected by this bill. If the President had not vetoed this appropriations bill, they would be back to work and citizens who want to visit their national parks would be having a good time.

The citizens in this country should take notice. Those who vote against this veto override are as responsible for this stalemate as the President.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are being given an extraordinary constitutional argument, namely that when the President of the United States exercises his constitutional right to veto, he is then to be held responsible for a shutdown of the Government. That is of course nonsense but it is confirmation of what we have here: people who want to make very drastic changes in public policy, who lack the two-thirds that the Constitution says you need to override a veto, who in the absence of the two-thirds want to hold the Government hostage.

But even on its own terms the arguments fail, because the problem is that the appropriations bills, this one included, were not passed by this congressional majority until months after they were supposed to. We are in a crisis in part because of the absolute incompetence of the majority, which kept them from passing the great majority of appropriations bills for months, did not get any passed on time, or maybe one. That is why we are in this crisis.

The Constitution allows the President to veto a bill, and then we have time for him to have the veto override considered, and then negotiations. When you wait 2½ months after the deadline and pass the bill, you have lost your right to complain about a veto.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

(Mr. TAUZIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, we are in this crisis on this bill I think for one reason. It probably was summarized in a letter the President sent to the Senate committee considering the bill on property rights.

His letter said, ''I don't care how you modify the bill, I don't care how you modify the environmental reform that the House passed, I will veto that bill. I will stand in the schoolhouse door and veto any environmental reform because I don't want to see any changes in the status quo.'' We see it reflected here. The President of the United States has said, ''I don't like the environmental reforms, I don't want any more trees cut in the Tongass Forest, so I will put 133,000 workers at risk of

not going to work because I am going to veto this bill.''

This President is not about to negotiate these changes. He is simply against them. He has promised his environmental friends he will stand in the schoolhouse door and veto bill after bill after bill that makes any attempt to modestly restrain the environmental extremists who have written some of these laws and regulations into existence. He will veto risk assessment/cost-benefit analysis, he will veto property rights, he will veto reforms in environmental legislation. He will veto them even if it means putting 133,000 workers out of business and the parks closed.

That is what this is all about. We ought to override that veto. We ought to put those workers back to work. We ought to make these modest reforms. It is a bill that has been approved by this House and by the Senate, by numbers sufficient to represent the majority will of the people of the United States. This President will not negotiate with us. We ought to override the veto.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman takes some poetic license here. I would like to see a copy of that letter where the President says, I will put 133,000 workers out and I will veto this bill because I do not want any reforms. The gentleman is taking some poetic license with this in quoting the President of the United States. I would like to see a copy of the letter.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to is a letter he sent to the Senate committee on property rights.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the quote in the letter that says, I will put 133,000 people out of work. The gentleman may produce that.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the letter I referred to, I will tell my friend, is a letter the President sent to the committee considering property rights legislation, one of the environmental reforms we have been fighting for on this House floor.

The letter I referred to is a letter from the President telling the chairman of that committee: I do not care how you change this bill, I will veto any bill on this subject matter that hits my desk regardless of how you change it. That is the upshot of his letter.

I will send the gentleman a copy of it. What I said is that that letter reflects the attitude of the White House. They will not negotiate with us on the environmental reforms. They will simply veto legislation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER].

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, but the point I am making, the gentleman stood in the well and he said the President said, I will put 133,000 people out of work. I do not believe he has that in print from the President of the United States. I do not care what rhetoric he uses about a letter that he sent to the other body. Show me in print where the President of the United States said, I will put 133,000 people out of work.

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

Mr. HEFNER. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, the President said that when he vetoed this bill. When he vetoed this bill, he said I would rather have 133,000 out of work than sign legislation that has modest environmental reforms.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, that is a conclusion; that is not a fact. And the gentleman knows it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HINCHEY].

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I think that it is quite clear what is happening here. The Government is shut down for one reason. That is because we have not passed a bill which passed the Senate. All we have to do is get that bill out on the floor here. With regard to the provisions of this bill before us now, what is happening simply is this: The Republicans want to override a veto.

The President vetoed that bill for a host of very good reasons. Among them is the fact that this bill would provide for the expedited application of mining patents, mining patents that are worth literally billions of dollars. Under the provisions of this bill, which the President vetoed, those applications would have to be processed in an unprecedented short period of time, in effect giving away to mining companies, many of whom are foreign mining companies, billions of dollars of American resources at bargain basement prices. That is what is at stake here.

These people tell us that they want to balance the budget. If they really wanted to balance the budget in a responsible and appropriate way, they would allow us to treat the resources of this country in accordance with their true value. If we believe in the free market, let that free market principle apply to public resources as well as private resources. Stop giving away the treasury of the country. Stop giving away the resources which will be passed on to future generations. You are allowing those resources to be exploited at bargain basement prices. Stop it. That is what this veto is all about.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill. No amount of rhetoric about men out of work or Federal workers out of employment can change that fact. That it is a bad bill was recognized on two occasions by the House in voting to recommit the bill. The President was right in vetoing this bill. It is a bad bill, and his veto should not be overridden.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] is recognized for 4½ minutes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, this bill deserves to be supported, and we should override the President's veto.

I wanted to just get some facts out here in the little time I have left. Indian education is above 1995. Indian health is above 1995. The native Americans get one-fourth, 25 percent of this bill, about $3 billion goes to native American programs.

I want to point out that we negotiated with the White House people, but they kept moving the goal posts. To show you how reluctant they were, they vetoed the bill, and then it took them 6 hours to decide what should be in a veto message. Normally you decide why to veto a bill and then veto it, but they were uncertain about what was wrong because they recognized that it basically was a good bill.

This is not about the EPA, that is not in this bill. It is not about welfare, that is not in this bill. It is not about Medicare. I have heard all these things from my colleagues on the minority side. It is about a mining moratorium. We just heard a speaker say we are going to give away our mineral resources. The moratorium in this bill stops that, but the President vetoed it. He wants to go ahead and give out all these patents and give away our mining lands because without this bill there is no moratorium.

My colleagues, we have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open the parks. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to put 133,000 people back to work. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open up 500 national wildlife refuges. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to open up 155 national forests. We have an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to support the Indian schools, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to welfare assistance to Indian children, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to the opening of the Smithsonian, the National Gallery of Art, the Holocaust Museum, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to retain the patent moratorium, an opportunity to vote ''yes'' to collect $8 billion in revenues that are generated by the Federal lands.

I would say to the 89 Members that voted ''yes'' to override the President to help securities litigation lawyers, I would think that, at a minimum, you would vote ''yes'' to open up all of the resources to the 260 million Americans that this bill represents. I urge all of my colleagues to vote ''yes'' to override the President's veto and open up

these facilities that belong to all Americans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

Under the Constitution, the vote must be determined by the yeas and nays.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 239, nays, 177, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 5]

YEAS—239

Allard
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baker (CA)
Baker (LA)
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brownback
Bryant (TN)
Bunn
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Chrysler
Clinger
Coble
Coburn
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cooley
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cremeans
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis
Deal
DeLay
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Doolittle
Dornan
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Ensign
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Flanagan
Foley
Forbes
Fowler
Fox
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frisa
Funderburk
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Greenwood
Gunderson
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Heineman
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Houghton
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kasich
Kelly
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Lincoln
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Longley
Lucas
Manzullo
Martini
McCollum
McCrery
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McKeon
Metcalf
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Montgomery
Moorhead
Myers
Myrick
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Parker
Paxon
Petri
Pickett
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Pryce
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Reed
Regula
Riggs
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer
Schiff
Seastrand
Sensenbrenner
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump
Talent
Tanner
Tate
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Torkildsen
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Waldholtz
Walker
Walsh
Wamp
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—177

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews
Baesler
Baldacci
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentsen
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Campbell
Cardin
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
de la Garza
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Fields (LA)
Filner
Flake
Foglietta
Ford
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hayworth
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Holden
Hostettler
Hoyer
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (MA)
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klink
LaFalce
Lantos
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney
Manton
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Miller (CA)
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Poshard
Rahall
Rangel
Richardson
Rivers
Roemer
Rose
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sawyer
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Spratt
Stokes
Stupak
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Velazquez
Vento
Volkmer
Ward
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Williams
Wise
Woolsey
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—17

Brewster
Bryant (TX)
Chapman
DeFazio
Fazio
Fields (TX)
Hoke
Lightfoot
Mfume
Norwood
Quillen
Stark
Stockman
Studds
Visclosky
Wilson
Wyden

□ 1328

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mr. Quillen and Mr. Lightfoot for, with Mr. DeFazio against.

So, two thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the veto of the President was sustained and the bill was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The message and the bill are referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The Clerk will notify the Senate of the action of the House.

□ 1330

EXTENSION OF MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT TO PRODUCTS OF BULGARIA

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1643), with the Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment, the Dole proposal, to open the Government, and that a motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Under the guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers as recorded on page 532 of the House Rules Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the gentleman's request until it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leadership.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the leadership on this side of the aisle has authorized me to make the motion I just did. Can we have any indication at all from the majority side as to whether or not there is any plan at all for them to allow the Dole proposal to be brought before us?

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a proper parliamentary inquiry.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, we will now be turning our attention to special orders for a period of time. During this period of time, the majority leadership will be working with and consulting with the majority Members on a broad range of questions and issues related to the temporary Government shutdown that has resulted from the President's veto of recent appropriations bills.

Mr. Speaker, we intend also during this period of time, while the House is entertaining special orders, to do some consulting with the minority leadership as well, and in anticipation of what might come of these sessions, I must advise the Members that until notified otherwise, we should expect that we would be coming back to the floor for business requiring votes at some time later in the day.

We will proceed with special orders; it would be my expectation that we would be able to come back, if things go well, and interrupt those. If not, and the special orders scheduled for the day were to be completed, we would even expect possibly to go into a period of recess while these discussions go forward.

The short point, of course, to the Members at large is, until notified otherwise, the Members ought to anticipate that there will be additional business which would include votes later in

the day; and I will return to the floor to inform the body, as things develop, of any additional information that might affect the manner in which they conduct their affairs today.

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

Mr. ARMEY. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. I would ask the majority leader what time he anticipates that we would resume business today.

Mr. ARMEY. I can only say to the gentleman that it is my anticipation that that could be at 5 or 6 o'clock tonight. Certainly I should expect that by that time I would have enough information to, if we do not call the Members back in for such business, at least advise Members further on what the schedule would be for the rest of the day and the rest of the week.

Mr. BONIOR. If the gentleman would continue to yield, it is my understanding also that the Senate has decided that they will not be in today, tomorrow, and the rest of the weekend. If that in fact is the case, at least that body not doing any business, what legislation could we put forward that would relieve the impasse that we are in?

It seems to me that the fastest and the best way to do that would be to take up the resolution by the majority leader of the Senate, Senator DOLE, and pass that and get this Government back to work.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. Let me just say there are a very broad range of things that will be under discussion, and we will be able to make a report later in the day.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I would be happy to yield.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I thank my colleague from Texas for yielding, and certainly I appreciate and support the minority whip on his comments.

I would like to indicate that I filed yesterday House Joint Resolution 155 that is a clean continuing resolution with several original cosponsors that would open the Government until January 19. I would like to know if the majority leader would allow a unanimous-consent request for that to be brought up on the House floor so that we could discuss that and debate that opening of the Government until January 19.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentlewoman for her inquiry. I can only say that at this time I am not prepared to entertain such a request.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Well, I thank the gentleman if he would consider it. I think that we have certainly an opportunity for bipartisan direction on this and support on this. I thank the gentleman.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will first entertain 1-minutes, if any Member wishes to give a 1-minute; and then we will move to special orders without prejudice to resumption of business.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I was detained in my district in Philadelphia yesterday afternoon. I would have voted ''present'' on the quorum call. I would have voted ''no'' on the motion to table the motion on the Chair's ruling, rollcall No. 2; and I would have voted ''no'' to override the President's correct decision to veto the Defense authorization bill, rollcall No. 3.

NEGOTIATING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, we are here today because we want to open the Federal Government. Our side is not looking to hurt Federal employees. I just want people to recognize that we are in a very, very difficult time of trying to balance the Federal budget. I think the other side needs also to recognize that we are making some progress.

President Clinton the other day decided that he would support a reduction in the capital gains tax, something that the other side has called ''a tax cut for the rich.'' The President now agrees, and I think it is incumbent, with the President's assurance that he will support a capital gains tax, that we give a little, that we work to negotiate, that we seek to reopen the Government.

The bottom line is a 7-year balanced budget, CBO, OMB, make sure they are real numbers, honest numbers that the American public can agree to, and we can resolve the stalemate here in Washington. But the American public, both Democrats and Republicans, universally agree that a balanced budget can and should be done in 7 years.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE EXEMPT FROM HARDSHIPS

(Mr. BROWDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWDER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the President and Members of Congress should be exempt from the same hardships that others endure. If we are unable to pay Federal employees, then we should not be able to pay ourselves during a shutdown. Like some other Members of this House, I have introduced legislation to prevent the President and Members of Congress from collecting paychecks during Government shutdowns, and I invite my colleagues to join me as a cosponsor of H.R. 2671.

It is not right that Federal employees should be made to suffer this outrage alone. Maybe a pay freeze would make the President and Congress take the situation more seriously. Cosponsor H.R. 2671.

PRESIDENT SHOULD SIGN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, you have just seen the House uphold the President's veto, and may I say that the minority side again has shut down the parks, the refuges, the monuments. It is the President who has not acted appropriately.

This is a body of two Houses and conferences, and we reached the right decision. We sent the bill to the President. He alone has shut down the parks. He alone has shut down the monuments. He alone is causing the pain, and it is time for the American public to say, Mr. President, sign the bills that Congress sends to you.

For those of you on the minority side, you are no longer in the majority, you are in the minority. So let us tell the truth. Let us have the President sign these bills. We will send them to him.

Mr. President, let us put the people back to work. It is your fault; it will continue to be your fault. Let us think about this country instead of the election in 1996.

PASS A CONTINUING RESOLUTION TO OPEN GOVERNMENT

(Mr. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is now 3 months and a few days since the fiscal year closed and since the Congress had a responsibility to enact a new national budget and to adopt some 13 appropriations bills. None of that has been done.

My Republican colleagues are anxious to tell us how the President can get the country back to work. Well, it is very simple. We can get the Government going again by the simple expediency of continuing the negotiations and by seeing to it that a continuing resolution in the proper form has been passed.

Our Republican colleagues have told us what they are going to do. The Speaker himself said this: I do not care what the price is, I do not care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time. He said he would shut the Government down and he has done so. Federal employees, citizens, everyone else is hurting because of this consequence.

My advice is, let us not slink out of town like a bunch of skulkers; let us pass a continuing resolution and get about the business of the country.

MEALS ON WHEELS LIVES

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I have a real problem. Just the other day the President comes on national television, and the first item he mentioned as part of the shutdown was Meals on Wheels. My wife devotes 1 full day a week plus other free time to Meals on Wheels in the private sector. I picked up the telephone today and I called every place I could think of in southwest Missouri, my district, and every meal is being delivered. Meals on Wheels has not been shut down.

Now, maybe there is a Government function that they call Meals on Wheels that is Government funded that is shut down. But the private-sector Meals on Wheels is delivering meals all over the United States, which is a real good example that the private sector can do a better job than the Government.

Meals on Wheels are being delivered, and I resent the President of the United States stating that my wife's volunteer work is not happening.

POLITICS IS THE ART OF COMPROMISE

(Mr. MORAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, the fact is that while Meals on Wheels are being delivered now, they will not if we do not pass the Dole continuing spending bill.

Mr. Speaker, politics is the art of compromise. Politics should not be the tactics of terrorism. Terrorism is when you take innocent hostages, punish them to achieve an objective that you cannot otherwise achieve through legal and democratic processes.

Federal employees, public civil servants, are being taken hostage, are being punished through no fault of their own, only because they choose to serve the American public and the American civil service. They are being punished, some having to work without pay, others being locked out of their jobs, being told it is illegal even to volunteer.

Now, three-quarters of a million Federal employees will not be able to pay for their rent, will not be able to even provide food for their families. It is wrong. Shame on this body.

□ 1345

WHAT THE BUDGET DEBATE IS ABOUT

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I will be willing to admit that it is unfortunate that Federal employees are being furloughed in this great debate. But they are not the only hostages. They are not the only innocent ones.

There are several hundred million people in this country who are held hostage by this whole process. The most innocent are our children and grandchildren, who are inheriting from this body a $5 trillion debt that will cost them in their lifetime, if they are born this year, $187,000 just to pay interest on the debt.

This is a great debate. It is not a sandbox fight. It is about the direction of the Government. The dollar amounts are insignificant. What the President cannot tolerate is turning back to individuals the right to make decisions about their own lives. The nanny state will wither away and the left will lose control over the lives of people. That is what this debate is about and I am on the side of the innocent children and grandchildren.

ACCEPTING RESPONSIBILITY IN BUDGET BATTLE

(Mrs. CLAYTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, both Democrats and Republicans on the Senate side were responsible in enacting a clean CR to put the Government back to work again. We have now been in a Government shutdown for some 20 days which is costing this Government at least $20 million each day. Twenty days of that, we just need to multiply that.

But, more importantly, it is costing the taxpayer their services that they deserve. Our country deserves better. Yet there are those on the other side, under the rubric of being responsible to their grandchildren and to the children, the innocent, and denying children of today opportunities.

How responsible is it for us to say that we should deny the opportunity and the responsibility for people to productively give back to their country what they will be paid? How responsible is it for us to pay people who are not actually working? It certainly is not responsible, nor is it civil, to deny the responsibility of us as Members of this Congress.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE

(Mr. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, a relationship, to work and survive, has got to be honest and we have got to deal with each other in good faith. For a government to govern well, we have to be honest and we have to deal with each other in good faith.

The President has vetoed every measure we have sent to him that would balance the budget. He has a constitutional right to do that. If he believes that our budget devastates the elderly, he has a moral obligation to fight us. I will never, never say bad things about somebody that follows their beliefs because that is what they should do. There comes a time, though, that one has an obligation to do more than just say no.

Mr. President, if you do not like our view of a balanced budget, give us your view. We cannot negotiate against ourselves anymore. You have a legal and a moral obligation to fight us when you think we are wrong. You have a legal and moral obligation to fulfill your commitment you made 40 days ago to put a budget on the table that balances. Please fulfill your obligation.

LEGISLATION PROHIBITING OVERSEAS TRAVEL BY MEMBERS DURING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week I noticed a newspaper account that said that notwithstanding the fact that there are over 700,000 Federal employees who are not being paid, there are still 50 Members of Congress, nearly 50 Members of Congress, who were scheduled to go on foreign trips during this shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, that is a slap in the face to the hard working Federal employees who want to be working and who should be paid. This is not the time for Members of Congress to be traveling overseas. And today the Speaker has scheduled a piece of legislation that allows us to be in recess for up to 3 weeks. That is wrong, too.

I have introduced legislation that would prohibit Members of Congress from traveling overseas during times of Government furloughs. It is wrong, and the Members of Congress should stay here and we should not recess ourselves. We should stay here, get these people back to work. They want to work. They should be working. It is simply wrong to do what this Government has done.

CALLING ON PRESIDENT TO STEP FORWARD IN BUDGET DEBATE

(Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor today to remind my colleagues that on November 20 the President of the United States did promise this House by law that he in fact would work with us, the House and Senate, for a balanced budget.

As the previous speaker from South Carolina has said, it is a fact we have no budget from the President. Six appropriation bills have gone to the President without signature. The facts are very clear. His not signing the appropriation bills has caused the furlough of Federal workers.

We want the Federal workers to go back to work. We want our constituents served. Republicans and Democrats in this House want a balanced budget, and we can do it by ending the gridlock, by having the President meet us halfway. The budget he gave us previously was $265 billion out of balance. Let us have a budget that truly balances, one that is going to be providing services to our people without bankrupting the Nation or the next generation.

BIPARTISANSHIP NEEDED TO RESOLVE IMPASSE

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take up the call of the gentleman from South Carolina. I think it is time for us to work in a bipartisan manner, and I have offered House Joint Resolution 155 that would open this Government by a continuing resolution, provide our employees that are furloughed an opportunity to come back to work and provide the services to the American people, and as well to pay the Government and to operate the Government at 90 percent funding.

I am very proud to say that I have been joined by Members GENE GREEN, AL WYNN, JAMES CLYBURN, BENNIE THOMPSON, PATSY MINK, EVA CLAYTON, TOM FOGLIETTA, LOUISE SLAUGHTER, EARL HILLIARD, CLEO FIELDS, DONALD PAYNE, XAVIER BECERRA, CORRINE BROWN, ROSA DELAURO, JIM MORAN, ALCEE HASTINGS, JOE KENNEDY, JOHN LEWIS, PATRICK KENNEDY, SANFORD BISHOP, LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, TOM BARRETT, HAROLD VOLKMER, and PAT SCHROEDER. We are all concerned that we work in a bipartisan manner to do what the American people have sent us here to do, to have this Government operating and, yes, work to balance the budget with the priorities that will benefit all of us who are Americans. I hope my colleagues will allow this to come to the floor today.

CREDIBLE WHITE HOUSE PLAN NEEDED TO END SHUTDOWN

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we have heard from the President that this shutdown in the Federal Government has been caused by freshman Republicans. I rise as a 5-term Republican who on many occasions has broken with my party to support the President on labor and environmental issues. But I will not break ranks with our party in this case, because the credibility of this administration in my mind is at question. I think the Philadelphia Inquirer, Mr. Speaker, summed it up best in their lead editorial today entitled, ''Your Turn, Bill.'' I will read the last paragraph, Mr. Speaker.

Congress should pass stopgap funding as soon as the President provides the missing ingredient of serious bargaining: a credible White House plan to balance the budget in 7 years.

To my liberal friends, I would say the Philadelphia Inquirer is not exactly a bastion of conservation politics. I would urge this President and my liberal friends to heed the advice of the Philadelphia Inquirer, and I will join with them in supporting a stopgap CR when this President lives up to the commitment of his words a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the editorial mentioned earlier.

YOUR TURN, BILL

''Enough is enough.'' That was the gist of Bob Dole's argument for passing a new, stopgap funding bill, even though there's no deal yet on a balanced budget. The partial shutdown is a wasteful exercise that could have ended yesterday if House Republicans hadn't rejected the idea.

Yet Newt Gingrich & Co. can rightly shout ''enough is enough'' at President Clinton. In the agreement that ended a shorter shutdown in November, the President promised a serious plan to balance the budget in seven years. The country is still waiting for his plan.

House Republicans have rejected short-term funding—and taken the heat for it—out of a legitimate concern that federal businesses-as-usual lessens pressure on Mr. Clinton to bargain seriously.

So the stalemate drags on.

The most aggrieved folks are nearly half a million ''essential'' workers in unfunded departments and agencies: They are being forced to work but won't be paid until Congress and the President agree on funding. Yesterday, a federal judge turned down the plea of two unions to bar the government from making their members work without pay.

No matter how this fiasco plays out, requiring people to work with out pay if fundamentally unfair. How would Republican lawmakers like to work without pay? They voted that idea down in the House, as Majority Whip Tom DeLay got all huffy about how he wasn't a federal employee, but ''a constitutional officer.'' Well, la-dee-dah, Mr. DeLay.

Another 260,000 ''nonessential'' workers are missing paychecks, but at least they're getting time off—and have been promised back pay for doing nothing: Ridiculous?

There's a middle way out of this morass that's less stubborn than the House GOP, but doesn't let Mr. Clinton off the hook as Mr. Dole did.

Congress should pass stopgap funding as soon as the President provides the missing ingredient of serious bargaining: a credible White House plan to balance the budget in seven years.

LET YOUR PEOPLE GO

(Mr. FARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a Member from the delegation of the great State of California. This is the State that is proud to lead this Nation in environmental, educational, and economic policy.

Unfortunately, it is also the State that showed that a legislative branch of government can bring Government to a halt by not adopting a budget on time. California's partisan politics delay the State budget year after year. However, never was it this bad.

Congress is now in its fourth month. We have been here more days, taken more votes, and spent more hours on the floor and accomplished less than any other Congress in history. Congress was unable to make the October 1 fiscal deadline. It is internationally embarrassing.

Mr. Speaker, give us back our Nation. Let your people go. Vote for a clean CR and get Government back to work.

AS THE POLLS TURN

(Mr. SCARBOROUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, let our people go? The Speaker and this House have bent over backwards. We have passed two balanced budget plans, we have passed appropriation bills.

The President vetoed the first balanced budget plan in a generation. The President has vetoed the Interior bill. The President has vetoed bills that would get funding for veterans' affairs, for HUD, for the Environmental Protection Agency.

This truly is the do-nothing President. His people are telling him at the White House, ''Do nothing, stand in the road, block progress, fight a balanced budget at all costs. That is what you need to do, Mr. President. Be firm, do nothing, and your poll points will go up.''

Maybe they will. I really do not care whether his poll points go up or not. The fact of the matter is we have put on the table the first balanced budget in a generation, and if the President wants to continue standing in the way of that, fine. We are going to balance this budget with or without him.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS HOUSE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be given 30 seconds to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would inform the gentleman that we are in 1-minutes. If the gentleman would be so inclined, if he has not given a 1-minute, he may get in line.

ANOTHER VICTIM OF SHUTDOWN

(Mr. EDWARDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read one more letter from a real person in my district, another victim of the Gingrich shutdown philosophy.

Mr. Edwards: I used to live on welfare but I fought my way out of the system. I'm employed at the VA hospital in Temple, Texas as a certified surgical tech. I'm not on food stamps, AFDC or Medicaid anymore. I support my children and take care of them through my job which I am not being paid for. The check I was to receive on January 2 was for rent, electric bills, food and gas. My 9-year-old's birthday had to be put on hold until I start getting paid again. I wish they could have felt my heartbreak when I told him and he started to cry.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to pass a resolution to put the Government and decent, hardworking Federal employees back to work. We can do that if Mr. GINGRICH and the House Republicans will let us take 15 minutes to vote in favor of a clean continuing resolution.

NO COUNTERPROPOSAL RECEIVED IN BUDGET DEBATE

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting. The previous speaker and all the others, they all voted against the override. If you wanted to get this birthday party done, you want to help these people out, why do you not vote for the bills? It is that simple.

The President has vetoed Interior, which would open national parks; the Justice Department; Commerce VA; HUD; EPA. These are all real things that would have opened the government. And yes, there is plenty of time to continue debating these issues and these spending levels. If you did not like this year's appropriations, go for it next year. Try to put in more money. We know you like to spend. But the President had vetoed these things and we have not seen yet a counterproposal.

That is what we have been looking for since November a counterproposal. What I do think is I share your concern about the furloughed employees. I want them to go back to work. I am not against a CR. But what I wish is that you would have the same urgency about the $20 billion a month we are spending in interest on the national debt. This money is going to be paid for by your children and my children. Let us show them the same compassion you pretend to show other groups.

□ 1400

TAX BREAK: CROWN JEWEL OF THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

(Mr. MARKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the budget negotiators finally got to the key issue in the budget debate: whether or not we are going to provide a $245 billion tax break largely for the rich in this country as part of the 7-year balanced budget plan.

The Republican Party considers the tax cut for the rich to be the crown jewel in their Contract With America, and they have promised to keep the Government shut down until we give this tax break to the rich. The crown jewel is a good metaphor, for without the tax cut for the rich, the contract will not sparkle, it will not shine. But it is a jewel at a great price. To pay it, we must cut student loans, we must slash Medicare, we must cut Medicaid, we must slash environmental programs.

The Gingrich budget promises 7 years of milk and honey and tax breaks for the rich, but 7 years of financial famine and locusts for the working-class people of our country.

FOCUS ON BALANCING THE BUDGET

(Mr. MCINNIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the gentleman's cute props and while I appreciate my colleague's earlier statements about the child that was crying, certainly we divert from the primary issue here, and that is to balance the budget for the Federal Government and focus on some short-term hardships.

We understand there are hardships out there. I have got a program that I am going to talk about on a 5-minute special order on how we can help on some of those, but do not let us lose focus on the most important issue facing this country in generations, and that is to balance this budget, to control Government spending. Remember, right now this Government spends $30 million an hour more than it brings in, and if you want to talk about an impact on the children and the future of this country, it is handing them this credit card, the congressional voting card, which is accumulating that kind of debt. That is what is going to break the backbone of this country.

We can focus on these short-term hardships. We can do something about it. But until we address the long-term problem, we are not going to get anywhere.

BRING UP THE LINE-ITEM VETO

(Mr. KANJORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but hear some of my colleagues on the other side engage in some rhetoric which I think is unfortunate at this time, I might say, on our side also. It sort of indicates where this impasse is starting to take this Congress, and I hope the American people will give us a little sufferance here because if they do not, they may start to believe that we have defeated the success of representative democracy in America under the Constitution as we know it.

The fact of the matter is we have a fundamental philosophical disagreement here, and we may have to recognize we are not going to come to a conclusion on it. We may not get an agreement on reconciliation and balancing the budget.

But this country must go on. What I would suggest is there is a tool, although I disagree with the tool, that was passed by this House and by this Senate but not sent to the President, that would resolve this problem, and that is the line-item veto. If the conference committee will meet today, agree on a conference report between the House and the Senate, bring it back to this House and send it to the President so he can sign it, he will have the authority to take the objectionable parts out of the appropriations bills which are keeping this Government shut down.

LET US GET TO A REASONABLE BUDGET AGREEMENT

(Mr. GANSKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot of hot air about tax cuts for the rich, tax cuts for the rich. Well, as many of the Members know, myself and another Member who is sitting in the body today earlier in the year worked hard to lower the tax cap for the $500-per-child tax credit. The conference bill is currently at $75,000 for a single earner and $110,000 for a couple.

Most people would say that that is reasonable, especially if you look at the fact that in 1950 the average income-earner family in this country was sending 5 percent of their income to Washington for Federal taxes and today it is over 25 percent. Remember also the President himself introduced a bill that had some tax cuts in it.

So I think what we are working at now, and as we said all along in the continuing resolution, was that we would put everything on the table, the level of tax cuts. The President has his. We have ours. Let us get some numbers and come to an agreement.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, enough is enough. I have sat here and listened to my Republican colleagues from Georgia and from the panhandle of Florida talk about what they really want in a budget. Maybe they need to call home and ask how many of their seniors are not being

able to apply for Social Security or how many of their veterans are not getting the health care they need or being able to apply for veterans' pensions.

The Federal employees are not the only ones that are hurting. In Houston we have thousands of people who are hurting. The passport office, we have 10,000 applications for passports, and they expect to grow by a thousand a week, that are not being issued. That is hurting business people who want to go overseas and sell our products. The Meals on Wheels program in Houston, I was interested to hear my colleague from Missouri talk about they are delivering them today, and they are in Houston. They say they only have enough money for another week or the 3,500 meals in Houston will not be delivered for seniors. The VA medical center, as of today, is only supplying, the contractor is only supplying for the VA medical center on an as-needed basis, so veterans are not getting the health care they have earned in supporting our country.

There is absolutely no reason to keep the Federal Government closed because they cannot get what they want in negotiations. Let us continue the negotiations. Let us also continue for the folks who are paying the bill.

TAXPAYER RESOURCES BEING SQUANDERED

(Mr. POMEROY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, this morning's front page of the Washington Post quotes the Senate majority leader with a very succinct comment, one which finds broad agreement all across the State of North Dakota. It says, ''People should work for their money.''

Yet the House of Representatives, the majority specifically in the House of Representatives, has created a situation today where thousands and thousands of Federal workers are prohibited from coming to their place of employment and discharging their services to the American people. Yet they have been assured by the same majority that shuts them out from their desks that they will now be compensated for this time.

Now, what could be more ridiculous than that? Not letting them come to work but paying them for staying at home, what is the point? The point is an awful lot of people are being hurt, the taxpayers' resources are being shamelessly squandered.

The Senate Republicans and Senate Democrats alike have voted to put this Government back to work, and it is time the House go along.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise the Members that Members are allowed one 1-minute speech during each legislative day. The Chair has notified other Members of that previously.

PRESIDENT HAS REDUCED THE DEFICIT

(Mr. POSHARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POSHARD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to reemphasize again, if I may, I hear various speakers coming up here and painting the President as the ogre with respect to balancing the budget, reducing the deficit.

I just want to point out that in 1992 this country was running a $310 billion deficit per year. It went down to $260 billion, to $200 billion, and this year to $161 billion.

This President, whom everyone accuses of being disingenuous about balancing the budget, has reduced the deficit $150 billion in 3 years, whereas the budget that we are being told we should agree to here and pass goes from $161 billion in this year to $151 billion, back up to $158 billion and down to $126 billion in the third year. The President's budget? It is $150 billion in 3 years. This budget that we are being told is a saving grace of America, $35 billion in the same amount of time.

HOW TO REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

(Mr. MANZULLO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the House just voted a few minutes ago to override the President's veto of the Interior appropriations bill.

Whenever the President vetoes a bill, that mean he does not like it. But when the President vetoed the Interior appropriations bill, that meant that 130,000 Federal employees could have been working, 369 national parks would have been open, 500 national wildlife refuges would have been open, 155 national forests would have been open.

Let us get candid about this. Whenever the President vetoes a bill, he shuts down the Government. If the President is complaining about the Government being shut down, all he has to do is to sign the appropriations bill. That is what this process is about.

So, if you want the Government to be open, all the President has to do is to sign the bills, the appropriations bills that Congress has sent to him. It is that simple.

IT IS TIME TO RETURN TO SANITY

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was listening to this debate on the floor, and I decided to come down. I wanted to tell some of my radical friends, since I always hear them called liberal friends, it is time to stop using our Federal employees, who are our fellow citizens, American citizens, as hostages.

I feel like we are in the Iran hostage situation again. It is time to stop using Americans who depend upon those Federal employees as hostages, and it is time to stop asking them to be the ultimate sacrifice in this process.

The fact of the matter is you want to impose your will, your extreme agenda as the law of the land, and that is not the American way. It is about negotiation, it is about compromise. It is not about blackmail and threat, and that is what is at stake here.

We are discussing about deeply rooted principles. I know you have yours, and we have ours. But it is time to stop using Federal employees and the American citizens who depend upon their services as hostages, and it is time to take the gun away from the President, which is what you are doing, at his head; it is time to return to some sanity in this House and in this country.

AMERICA WANTS A BALANCED BUDGET

(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there you have it, we have been called gruesome, we have been called extreme, we have been called radical, we have been called just about every name in the book because we want to do something so extreme and so radical as to balance the budget using honest numbers.

People back home are saying to me, ''Dave, if you can't do it, who will do it? And if we can't do it now, when will we do it?''

The time has arrived. The President is vetoing all of these bills that we put before him because we do not spend as much money as he wants to spend. Those are the bottom-line issues in his vetoes. He wants to spend more money than we want to spend.

We want to balance the budget. He has not presented a budget that balances. He has not presented to us a budget that, when we give it to the CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, and they analyze the numbers, it does not come to balance in 7 years. The American public wants the budget balanced.

WE MUST WORK OUT OUR DIFFERENCES

(Mr. HEFNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentlemen are missing the point here. We are talking about a balanced

budget all the time. We are talking about opening up the Government.

All Presidents past, Gerald Ford, Ronald Reagan, Jimmy Carter, George Bush, when they had a disagreement, it is their perfect right to veto a bill.

Incidentally, the bills that President Clinton got were far late. They were not anywhere near the time they were supposed to be here.

The President has the right to veto a bill, and then you work out the differences.

This is totally ridiculous to say, ''If you don't sign these bills like we passed them, like we want them, we are going to close the Government down and put all of these people out of work.''

That is the process. The President has the right to veto a bill, and then you work with appropriations or the authorizers and then you work out the differences. You do not just get mad and throw a tantrum and close the Government down, our VA hospitals that are so vital to the people of this country.

It is just not Federal employees it is hurting. It is average working people out there that depend on the services of the workers.

This is totally ridiculous, holding them hostage because you have got a temper tantrum because you cannot have it like you want it.

WE MUST DEAL WITH THE DEBT AND THE DEFICIT NOW

(Mr. GILCHREST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, if there is anybody in the Chamber who was born in 1946, they are now the quintessential baby boomer. They are 50. That means in 15 years or a little bit less or a little bit more, they are going to retire. If we do not reform what we are doing now, if we do not reform Medicare, there is going to be no health care for those retirees.

□ 1415

Mr. Speaker, if we do not reform Social Security, there is going to be no Social Security for those retirees. If we do not do something about the debt, which is about $5 trillion, there will be no economic structure for the baby boomers' children to operate under.

It is time for us to deal with this debt, with this budget. We want to put the Federal workers back to work. We want the President to sign the bills, which he can today, to put these people back to work. We need to get rid of the politics, shift the focus back to the budget and some of this Nation's problems.

HOUSE-PASSED BUDGET INCREASES ANNUAL OPERATING DEFICIT IN 1996

(Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish a couple of my colleagues would take the time to read the report from the Congressional Budget Office that says that the budget that has passed this House increases the annual operating deficit for this Nation in 1996. It does not decrease it, it increases it.

Even when they cook the numbers, it increases the annual operating deficit by $7 billion. You do not balance the budget by taking your first step backward.

The second thing I would like to do is commend those wonderful men and women who work for our Nation's veterans hospitals, taking care of the people who came home from our wars in a situation much worse than they left, who are working for reduced pay. I want to tell them it is my deepest regret that they are not being fully compensated for what they have done. We have tried three times on the House floor on the Democratic side to bring a budget bill straight to the floor under an open rule that if people wanted to amend, they could, and three times now the Speaker of the House has ruled that would not happen. We will continue to work in your best interests.

BALANCED BUDGET IN 7 YEARS IMPORTANT FOR THE FUTURE

(Mr. ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, we are where the road forks in this country's history. We are talking about business as usual or whether we really want to bring some change to this place.

I have a lot of empathy and support, or concern, about Federal employees who may not be having an opportunity to work, and I think we need to look at our policy as a way we handle these kinds of public discussions and we ought to set a policy that allows them to go back to work if they wanted to.

But we are talking about whether we are going to balance the budget in 7 years using real figures, or whether we are going to go over here and do business as usual, as we have been doing for the last 40 years. That is where this crossroad is.

The President simply is not sitting down and looking at what we can do with real numbers in 7 years to balance the budget. We have to do that if we are going to have any kind of future for our children and grandchildren. It is imperative. It is important.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN UNFAIR

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it is time for this House of Representatives to get a grip. The shutdown of the Federal Government is unworthy of a great country. The irresponsible actions of this House have increased the economic uncertainty of our Federal workers. Whether they get paid eventually or not is unknown, but what is known is that those industries which depend on the Federal Government operating will never be made whole.

Think, in our area in California, Mariposa County has appealed to Governor Wilson to declare them a disaster area because of the loss of business due to the closing of Yosemite Park. It goes on and on, with coffee shops and stationery stores and all the rest who do business as a result of the Federal Government and Federal buildings being functioning.

Mr. Speaker, for a Nation that prides itself on the issue of fairness, this shutdown is unfair to the American taxpayer, unfair to the Federal workers, unfair to American businesses who want to engage in trade. We are not able to protect our environment, to conduct our foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, if this is the tactic that the Republicans want to use, then in a sense of fairness we should not be accepting our own paychecks.

CONGRESS SHOULD ACT RESPONSIBLY AND BALANCE THE BUDGET

(Mr. MICA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I care about our civil servants, and I care about our Federal employees who are without compensation and who are not working today. But the pain now being felt by our Federal employees will be exactly the same pain felt by all Americans in the next decade if this House and this Congress fail to act.

Let me give an example. Some Federal employees recently received half of their monthly salary, and all of their benefits were taken out and their costs of benefits were taken out of their paycheck, and that is exactly the type of paycheck that Americans will receive in 10 years if we fail to act and act responsibly at this time.

So I urge my colleagues to hold tight, to balance the budget, and to act responsibly now.

HOUSE SHOULD HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO VOTE ON SAME RESOLUTION THAT SENATE PASSED

(Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the dilemma that we face here today could be corrected in about 1 hour. All it would require would be for the Speaker of this House to bring to the floor the same resolution that Senator DOLE brought on the other side and in the other body. We could put everybody back to work, ensure that

Means on Wheels obligations were honored, ensure that benefits were extended to those who were deserving of them, and it could be accomplished this afternoon.

But you know what the compelling truth here is today? That a radical element in this House that is out of touch with realities across this Nation, they have decided that they are going to hold Federal employees and our senior citizens hostage to their point of view, and that is precisely what they are doing today.

If Senator DOLE can bring the U.S. Senate Democrats and Republicans along, surely we ought to have an opportunity in this institution to simply vote on a measure to reopen this Government. That should be done today, and I guarantee if that simple measure was brought to the floor, it would pass easily.

THE UTAH CENTENNIAL—100 YEARS OF STATEHOOD

(Mr. HANSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 4, 1896 President Grover Cleveland stated:

> Now, therefore, I, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States of America, in accordance with the act of Congress aforesaid, and by authority thereof, announce the result of said election to be as so certified, and do hereby declare and proclaim that the terms and conditions prescribed by the Congress of the United States to entitle the State of Utah to admission into the Union, have been duly complied with, and that the creation of said State and its admission into the Union on an equal footing with the original States is now accomplished.

The centennial is a time to remember our roots which allows us to pass our heritage on to others. For nearly 50 years, Utah teetered on the brink of statehood. Our predecessors understood the value of industry and hard work. Early settlers planted crops, built roads, schools, mercantiles, and by 1869, hailed the linkup of the transcontinental railroad. Utahns have always recognized the need to be prudent with their resources, cherished education, and esteemed family and the community.

It is a celebration not just for Utah but one for the world. Invited leaders from 59 nations will attend the celebration to honor the immigrants from their countries who helped make Utah what it is today.

This is a moment we've all been waiting for. It is a time for pondering and expressing our gratitude for the wonders of the State and a time to ponder the past and plan for the future.

Gov. Mike Leavitt stated, and I agree, that "with the caliber of citizens in this State today, the legacy of quality that our predecessors worked so hard to establish will undoubtedly be carried on for future generations."

I, as well as many others, reflect upon our Utah history, and recognize that the struggles and sacrifices of our early settlers to achieve statehood have made Utah one of the most prosperous States in the country. I am proud to represent the great State of Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members join with me in celebrating Utah's 100-year birthday.

HOUSE OF LUNATICS

(Mr. VOLKMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, back last month I made a speech on this floor about this being the biggest show on Earth, that Ringling Brothers-Barnum & Bailey did not hold a candle to this place.

Well, it is not even a good show any more. It is a house of lunatics right now. You can look around. Mr. Speaker, there is not hardly anybody here. Yet we have got Federal employees not working, we have got agencies shut down, and this House is doing absolutely nothing. There is not anybody here.

You talk about a place that no one should actually want to be connected to. And every day that I serve here under this new leadership, under these radical Republicans, I just think, you know, this is not a House of Representatives; this is a place like a zoo, and they do not even know how to run it. They do not know how to run a House.

I would say lunacy has really taken over. And then they blame the President for what we are not doing here.

REPUBLICANS CONCERNED WITH BALANCING BUDGET

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to give a 1-minute speech, but I thought I would reply to the gentleman before me, because I think he knows and I know that his party shut down the House of Representatives, shut down Congress, shut down the Government nine times. You were involved in the last 10 or 12 years in almost every kind of parliamentary move, chicanery, in dealing with the White House at that time, owned and operated or run by Republicans, the Republican Presidents there. And your party was involved in doing much more than we have even started to do, which is to try to balance the budget.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the folks on that side of the aisle that I hear time and time again that the Republicans are doing all this for tax cuts for the rich. Let me give them a quick review of the Los Angeles Times story from yesterday, where it says "Clinton set to accept capital gains tax."

If you are going to run around here saying we have tax cuts for the rich, you better talk to your own President.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair will now recognize Members for the special order speeches without prejudice to the possible resumption of legislative business.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

[Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SHUTDOWN HURTING AMERICAN PRIDE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I wake up in the mornings and sometimes wonder what world I am in, because I realize I am going to go to work, and actually I have the privilege of still going to work, many Federal employees do not, that I am going to work, but I am going to go to work under these conditions: That I am working in a country that has been shut down partially for 20 days; where the Centers for Disease Control is not able to respond effectively; where the Environmental Protection Agency is not able to respond to safe drinking water complaints; where children are soon going to be ushered out of Head Start programs.

That is bad enough. I then realize there are thousands of workers capable of fulfilling those functions who are not going to fulfill those functions, but apparently are going to be paid for doing it. The issue is not whether or not they are going to be paid; the issue, of course, is why are they not working? They should be working.

So, Mr. Speaker, is this some Third World country we are talking about? No, this is the United States of America. You remember the America of "Send in the Marines," "Wherever you go, you shall be safe"? Remember the America, where you hold up the silver dollar and the eagle is always strong, and the flag flies free and proud? That is our America.

Why is this America being treated now to this kind of situation? All of us ought to be gravely concerned about this. I hear a lot about how it is necessary to shut this Government down partially to get a balanced budget. While this Government is being shut down in that perhaps laudatory goal, at the same time a lot of other budgets are being significantly unbalanced.

Yes, the Federal employee, such as the person being evicted in my district today.

But it goes beyond that. It goes to the small businesses that will not be getting their Small Business Administration loan guarantees. It goes to the vendors; it goes to Federal services; it goes to the business person who is trying to get abroad to sell products for his or her company, which brings dollars and jobs back to this country.

□ 1430

And so those are the budgets that are being unbalanced. Thousands, perhaps millions across this country every day. And when do we hear about those?

I hear a lot about how because many of us voted to sustain the President's veto, in effect not approving the Interior appropriations bill a little while ago, or Commerce, State, Justice yesterday, that somehow that shut the Government down.

It is interesting, because 9 of the appropriation bills that run this government, 9 of the 13, were not to the President's desk by October 1, which is the beginning of the financial year. Some of them did not get there for months, but even then, does a veto, a Presidential veto mean somehow the Government is shut down?

I have had the privilege of serving in this Congress now through President Reagan and President Bush, as well as President Clinton. Basically, in all that time under the House leadership, and it was a Democratic leadership except for, of course, the present one, in no time during that period did this Government ever shut down because the House leadership said to President Reagan, with whom there was great differences, or said to President Bush, we are going to shut this entire Government down because you have vetoed an appropriations bill. We keep the Government moving in an orderly fashion.

Never, never have I seen this kind of situation. In fact, I challenge anyone to find a 20-day shutdown. Congratulations. I consider it the legislative Heisman Trophy for bringing a government to its knees.

Now, what is the impact that goes beyond the Federal budget? Let us talk for a second. Forty million dollars a day of payroll to workers who are not being able to do their jobs. That is the first loss to the taxpayers. The last 4-day shutdown in November cost this Government, cost the taxpayer, $700 million for 4 days in payroll as well as lost revenues.

It means that half the Head Start children in this country soon will not be able to attend that program. Who pays for that? What is the loss to those children?

It means the Centers for Disease Control cannot respond to flu outbreaks. It means, for instance, that in the State Department, where just during the last shutdown an anguished father contacted me about his children in Russia who needed visas to get their adopted children out. There is no one there to service them all across the globe.

They are talking now in Vietnam about dunning our representative there $1,600 for electricity or water. We are buying utilities on credit cards in some of our embassies.

Meals on Wheels. Very important in rural West Virginia, but across the country as well. The only contact many senior citizens have with the outside world endangered.

SBA is now unable to make $40 million a day in loan guarantees. How many small businesses are there? About 260 a day, actually, that need that money to either meet their line of credit, to start that new product, or to hire a couple of extra people.

Export licenses from the Department of Commerce are backed up. Billions of dollars of lost opportunities. Those are American jobs, jobs exporting abroad, not able to do it.

Got a problem with your water? Concerned about it? Do not call the EPA, you will only get voice mail. The EPA. We are not able to respond to basic environmental concerns? The fact is negotiators need to negotiate and Federal Government workers need to work.

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

[Mr. HORN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

SUPPORT A CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION TO OPEN THE GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I may be comforted that I have heard more voices coming to this well and really asking in a very sincere and honest manner can we not all get along; and, in fact, answer the American people in an affirmative answer by saying we can and we will open this Government, and we will allow our citizens to go back to work not so much because they are Federal employees, but because they are public servants who are doing the business of the public, providing essential and necessary responsibilities that this Government is entrusted to do.

With that, I am comforted by the more than 40 of my colleagues that have joined me in supporting a clean continuing resolution that would open this Government for at least 2 weeks, to January 19, fund the existing operations at at least 90 percent, so that we would not have the crisis that we are facing.

In Houston we have only four Environmental Protection Agency employees. They cannot do their job. So communities like Pleasantville and Kennedy Heights, that would need the services of the Environmental Protection Agency dealing with Superfund cleanup responsibilities, they cannot get toxic waste areas cleaned up. The Superfund monies have been depleted as of last Tuesday.

This clean continuing resolution would allow us to continue to debate these very emotional issues dealing with the budget; whether we should have a $245 billion tax cut; whether or not we should shut down 57 schools in Texas by prohibiting them from having direct student loans for their students. And when I say shut down, shut down the opportunity of those students to go to college.

I might add, too, that the list is growing of supporters who want this resolution to come to the floor, and it is different from the one of the other body, because the other body's resolution was until January 11. And I applaud Senator DOLE, but now we have come to the end of this week and we still have not gotten a budget compromise. So FRANK PALLONE, ROBERT MENENDEZ, CHET EDWARDS, BOB WISE, CHUCK SCHUMER, HENRY B. GONZALEZ, MIKE MCNULTY, IKE SKELTON, GENE TAYLOR, JERRY NADLER, KAREN THURMAN, BOBBY SCOTT, EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, BILL HEFNER, LYNN RIVERS, MIKE WARD, and WILLIAM JEFFERSON are now adding their names to this effort of bipartisanship.

As we speak today, we are losing $50 million a day, ladies and gentlemen, my colleagues, by this shutdown. All total we have lost $550 million. We are in the middle of a peacekeeping responsibility in Bosnia. Our young men and women need us. We need our resources. We need to use our tax dollars effectively.

What have we seen in the headlines besides the budget? We see corporations laying off 40,000 people. We need to be in the business of providing and creating jobs. Our small businesses in the 18th Congressional District, who would receive small business loans, which, in fact, in my view, are the backbone of America, cannot, in fact, get those loans to keep their employees hired.

And, likewise, those small businesses who are involved in Government contracts, they are unable to meet their obligations because they are not getting paid. Businesses that rely on contracts for services with the Small Business Administration are at a risk during this shutdown. In fact, several businesses who are awaiting payment from the Small Business Administration are closing their doors. That may not be 40,000 employees, ladies and gentlemen, it may amount to hundreds of thousands. And the reason is because this country is filled with independent entrepreneurs who I am so very proud of who are trying to work.

So I would ask the leadership, the Republican leadership, join me with this continuing resolution. It is offered

in a bipartisan effort. We have over 40 Members who have joined already to cosponsor a resolution that would open the Government, stop the bleeding, stop the loss of money, but let us continue to debate whether we cut Medicare and Medicaid, whether we cut the education loans, whether we cut in the environment, but open the Government so we are not losing $50 million a day.

This funds the Government at 90 percent. It allows people to be back at work doing the nursing home inspections that they are entitled and must be responsible to do, opening the national parks, opening the monuments, taking down the image internationally that the Government is shut down. Our embassies have had to send out letters to ensure our foreign governments that we are, in fact, not a government in crisis or revolution. This should not be.

And let me remind my colleagues that under the Constitution we are to work with the three branches of government, and we must work with the President and this House and the Senate. Let us work together, pass House Joint Resolution 155, and allow us to open this Government up. It is most important. House Joint Resolution 155. Let us pass it and open the Government.

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

[Mr. JONES addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order in place of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

TALK IS EASY; BALANCING THE BUDGET IS DIFFICULT

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

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, actually, I do believe with some of the Members here on the floor, we could actually work out the budget deal. Don't you think? That is about how I feel at the moment, is to override that which is down below the hill so that we can get it done.

One thing that did bother me, before I start in on this, is when I heard one of my colleagues mention the word ''perhaps.'' Balancing the budget is perhaps a laudatory thing to do. Perhaps is kind of a word like a maybe. Like balancing the budget may be a good thing to do. It does not imply any form of desirability, which, in fact, bothers me somewhat, and that is the problem that we have.

It is easy to talk about let us balance the Nation's budget, but when we actually get down to doing it, it is very difficult. One thing that is bothersome is, whether it is the Republicans or whether it is Democrats, there is this blame game that goes on in this town. And when we feel the heat back home by our constituents or Federal workers or someone who cannot get a passport or visa, it is easy to quickly blame someone else. Or if, in fact, someone is working in a Veterans Administration and someone calls to have a need and they say, well, just call your Congressman. They would like to blame the Congress, and that is an easy thing to do.

There is something that confronts us, though, and that is the Federal Government cannot sustain its current fiscal policies. I do not care who we are or what our background is or our partisanship, that is a fact. The spending commitments will far exceed the revenues available to meet the Federal Government's obligations. That is a fact. So we cannot deal on assumptions. Assumptions carry great liability.

Facts are stubborn things. It is a condition, not a theory, which presently confronts us. Look at this chart here for a moment. This is what confronts us. We have a national debt. Look at this national debt and the explosion. There is a great blame game when they say this national debt. They blame it on the 12 years of the Reagan-Bush era, as if Congress did not pass spending bills. So when they cut taxes, they did not cut spending, and we got a mushroom in the national debt.

I came to Congress in 1992. I am not interested in a blame game here. I know what confronts us. Fact is what confronts us.

If my colleagues would time travel with me and we say, now in the year 2002 we balance the budget, well, this bothers me. I am not satisfied. I am not satisfied because I know the national debt will continue to grow from its $4.9 trillion today to around $6.8 or $6.9 trillion. This national debt, this will take us up to about 2030 to 2035 to bring it back into better balance. I will not even be alive.

So people say, STEVE, why are you doing this? It is very easy to come here to the floor and say all of these things. Oh, my gosh, we have Federal workers not being paid. Here are some of the impacts. Here is someone that needs a visa to come back to school from whatever country they are from. Or here is someone that needs to go overseas for a particular job, or whatever is going on.

There are numerous examples, and we can go on and on and on. Do we give in to the moment or do we permit the eyes of our minds to see the greater vision? And the greater vision is saving the country. Save the country. Because if we permit the national debt to just mushroom and balloon like it is, I know what countries do whose debts become unmanageable. They devalue their currency.

I will submit this to the American people. If they see Members of Congress leaving this institution and they are starting to buy gold, Americans better buy gold, because we can see what is about to happen.

So it is easy to come here and wrap ourselves around whatever issue. There is no ownership on the issues of compassion. Some like to believe there are, but there are not. I neither believe that the milk of human kindness has soured, nor will I give in to the tears of vexation.

Mr. Speaker, I look at this chart and I think what a luxury President John Kennedy must have had when he came to this town in the early 1960's. Because at that time he had 70 percent of the budget that was discretionary spending. Seventy percent. Twenty-three percent was entitlement, 7 percent was interest on the debt. By 2002, the discretionary spending will have gone from the 70 percent all the way to only 28 percent.

□ 1445

So when we subtract 16 percent of the 28 percent for the military budget, we are not arguing over much anymore, because the mandatory spending side, entitlements and interest, they overtake itself. It is wrong and we have to balance the budget. Let us not give in to the rhetoric today.

CLEAN CONTINUING RESOLUTION WILL PUT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], who just spoke, for his steadfastness for an effort to balance the budget, but I must disagree with him to the extent as far as he will go by saying that we must have a vision, and the vision is that we balance the budget in 7 years, and in the meantime, we make people suffer unendlessly. Those people who are suffering are innocent victims, not only Federal employees but contractors, private businesses, et cetera, in order to reach that goal, and it is not necessary.

Mr. Speaker, I tell the gentleman from Indiana, he and others on his side had an opportunity to vote for the coalition balanced budget amendment that many of us supported, and they did not, for the sole reason that it did not include a big tax cut for the wealthy. That is the only reason.

So, it tells me that what they really want is a big tax cut for the wealthy at the same time they want to cut back on Medicare, et cetera. But that is not

really why I want to take the 5 minutes. I just want to emphasize that I, too, support a balanced budget in 7 years, but I do not want to give the tax cut and cut Medicare and all those other things at same time.

We can have a balanced budget. There is no question in my mind that if the majority party would decide to go with the coalition budget, we could pass it and I think the President would sign it and we would have it done, but that is not what they want.

The other thing, what I really came here to talk about is I keep hearing in this well, and I heard it in December and I have heard it ever since December 15, telling us that the President has not come forth with his budget; that he agreed in the November 20 continuing resolution to bring a balanced budget. That is not what it says.

Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the gentleman from South Carolina and others who have made that statement, that they either cannot read, and that is a sorry affair for somebody to be in the Congress that cannot read, or, if they can read, they do not understand what they read.

I would like to read to the Members of Congress, for those who have not read that resolution, what it actually says.

Section 203: Commitment to a 7-Year Balanced Budget. The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002, as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office; and, the President and the Congress agree that the balanced budget must protect future generations, ensure Medicare solvency, reform welfare, and provide adequate funding for Medicaid, education, agriculture, national defense, veterans and the environment. Further, the balanced budget shall adopt tax policies to help working families and stimulate future economic growth.

This does not say anything about the President submitting a balanced budget to anybody, but yet they keep insisting the reason they shut down the Government is because the President has not submitted a balanced budget to them. They submitted their balanced budget and they say the President has not submitted his.

Mr. Speaker, the President never agreed to do that. There is not one statement in there about the President submitting a balanced budget. What is really interesting to me is the conditions that they now put on a CR, continuing resolution. Back on October 1, we had a CR, a continuing resolution, that ran into November. It did not have any conditions.

The President stands today, and we on this side stand, ready to sign and vote for a continuing resolution to keep this Government going. We proved that yesterday. We wanted to take up the resolution of Senator DOLE, the majority leader from the Senate, that would have kept this Government working, but we could not get 20 Members from the other side to go along with us. We got 2, and that is all from the majority party.

The Gingrich Republicans refused to let us even take that up. They said, ''No. We are going to keep the Government shut down until we get our way.'' Pure blackmail. That is all it is.

Mr. Speaker, this has never happened before in the history of this country. We have never had a shutdown to this magnitude and to this length of time. And how much longer will it go? Well, we are going to have to ask Speaker GINGRICH, because he is the only one that can tell us. All the rest of the Republicans are going to follow him just like a pied piper. If he decides that we do a continuing resolution, we will do it. If he decides we do not, we will not. So, we will have to ask Speaker GINGRICH whether this is going to last another month, a week, 2 weeks or whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I say all we need is a continuing resolution, a clean one, and we can get everybody back to work. We can still negotiate on a balanced budget.

REQUEST FOR SPECIAL ORDER

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes in place of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

CONSEQUENCES OF GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker and Members of this body, it was yesterday that I took part in a bipartisan press conference that dealt with a group called the Federal Employee Emergency Assistance. It was there that we discussed the fact that the people who are receiving the assistance by and large are people who are receiving income in the range of $20,000 to $27,000 a year, who are single heads of household; most of them are women.

Can my colleagues imagine these people who are not receiving a paycheck who have to pay rent or a mortgage or utility bills? Well, I and my colleagues who were there have pledged support to this fund, but this fund should not be so overloaded, as it is now, with the calls that are coming in, the emergency calls, if we did not have this shutdown.

This is day 20. I have spoken often about it. My colleagues have spoken often about it. Every day the circumstances become more dire in terms of the consequences. We have problems now with the Centers for Disease Control not being able to perform its functions and NIH not being able to perform their functions. Blood banks are running out of the supply of blood. Meals on Wheels is facing the consequences of a shutdown.

We know also that there has been some discussion about having a continuing resolution bit by bit to put a few more agencies back in operation. I would submit to this House that if we have a bit-by-bit continuing resolution, that we are going to have a lot of organizations, people, American citizens, falling through the cracks, because there are enormous consequences and ripple effects of this shutdown.

Home buyers, home buyers who are looking for the VA or FHA loans would be affected by it. Federal contractors would be affected by it. I brought just a few of the many, many letters I have received from Federal contractors. That means jobs and continuation of employment.

HIV–AIDS, a stop work order for a company in Montgomery County, MD. Another company that is dependent on tourism in publications has had to lay off people. Another company that deals with the EPA. Another one that deals with the EPA through Superfund. Can my colleagues imagine the toxic waste sites that will not be cleaned because of this?

Aerospace, information and environment, NASA, these are all contractors that even if we pay our Federal employees, and I have been involved very much in making sure they will be paid, these Federal contractors will not be paying these people who are furloughed and some may even lose health benefits over a period of time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say we have got to work together. A clean continuing resolution is what we want until we reach the resolution of this budget in terms of the deliberation. I say to the President, get that 7-year budget scored by CBO in front of the negotiators. I say to the negotiators, stay there, stay there until it is done. I say to my colleagues, I hope the President and I hope my colleagues will consider withholding their salaries when Federal employees are not being paid. I say to my colleagues, there should be no recess for this House until we get the Government back in full operation.

CONGRESS SHOULD DO A REALITY CHECK AND REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor, as many others have, to point out here it is, Thursday afternoon. It is the 20th day of the shutdown and the Congress has no business, and that is because we are not allowed to bring up the main business that everyone in America wonders why we are not dealing with and the sad fact the Government is shut down.

The Government is shut down and we are being denied the right to come to

this floor, have a debate on that, and put the bills up so everybody can see how we vote. We have had over 12 votes on whether or not to keep this Government open. Yesterday we had one, and it was to try and bring up the resolution that came from the other body, the resolution that came unanimously from the other body, the resolution that said enough is enough is enough is enough in a bipartisan unanimous fashion and said reopen the Government, and we were denied the right to bring that up.

Now, all day long I heard people give excuses. I heard that someone should come down with their keys, and they said, ''I do not have the key to open the Government on my key chain.'' Yeah, every one of us do. It is not a key; it is a voting card. We all have got a voting card. That is the key to opening the Government up.

There have been 12 votes. If you look at how people vote, you will find that of the majority in this body, the Gingrich Republicans have voted no-no-no-no-no every single time, and now because they are afraid we might win we are not allowed to bring anything up.

Mr. Speaker, let me just point out there are a few more historic data that we should have out there. It is also almost 100 days into this fiscal year, 100 days, and we have not finished the budget. Can you believe it? We are almost a third of the way through it and we have not tapped it.

Second, it is the first anniversary of Speaker GINGRICH taking the gavel. I remember a year ago sitting here when he was talking about we were going to have open rules, we are going to debate these things, and so forth. Well, 1 year later we cannot even bring up the bills that we think are fair.

Mr. Speaker, we think we should be able to bring up the Senate resolution opening the Government. We think we should not be receiving our pay when there are Federal employees out there not receiving their pay. Here we are with our held harmless policy, and we said we were going to abide by the laws everyone else did.

What about all the contract employees you are hearing about? Well, it is OK. We will get charity for the Federal employees. We will get them interest-free loans. We know there are 10,000 contractors with employees alone dealing with EPA and Superfund sites that have been shut down. Now, those 10,000 contractors all happen to have employees, and we have no way to guarantee that they get to come back to work or they get their pay or what happens to them.

Mr. Speaker, that is just one teeny weeny little facet. So to say we will try and get charity for the Federal employees still does not have anything to do with the magnitude that is out there. We know 240 small businesses a day are denied the money that they need from the Small Business Administration for bridge loans for creating new jobs, for expansion, for whatever. What happens to that fallout?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on and on, but I think the thing that makes me the craziest is listening to this piety about we have to do this because of a balanced budget and because the President is not using the right numbers and he will not come down with the right numbers for the year 2002. Reality check, people. We have not even done the budget for this year. We should be talking about the year 2002?

Next reality check. In the year 2002, this President, even if he is reelected, will not be President in 2002. This President cannot bind future Presidents.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you another reality check. Most of us are not going to be in this body in the year 2002, especially if we keep acting like this bunch of clowns that it looks like to the average person. Even if we were, we cannot bind future Congresses.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are not doing our work this year and blaming it on the fact we do not like the kind of budget the President is committing to 7 years from now when he will not even be here and saying our numbers are not as good or his numbers are not as good as the numbers they have.

Mr. Speaker, we also hear about how much better and how much more they care about the balanced budget. I am a Member who voted for the Democratic budget on this floor, and I want to tell my colleagues on the other side, your scoring office, the Congressional Budget Office, will tell you that the budget that I voted for has a much lower deficit than the ones the majority party is pushing. The Congressional Budget Office says that in the year 1997, ours is $30 billion below in deficit, and I could go on with the rest of the numbers. But let us get the facts and do the reality. Let us get the Government open, and let us stop playing games.

□ 1500

SOME OF THE FACTS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take some time to deal this afternoon with something that often is lost in this debate. That is some of the facts.

Yesterday the President of the United States in a press conference went before the American people and made a series of statements about what this shutdown, and he blamed it on the Republicans, would do. I thought this afternoon it would be interesting to deal with some of the facts and our perspective and what this debate is all about. A lot of the debate is about spending more, as they have done in the past, and getting less in return.

Let us look at what the President said. He said this week the Meals on Wheels Program for seniors will run out of money. I talked to my seniors in my district. Some of the senior citizens are in the Meals on Wheels Program. I talked to them. They said: Mr. MICA, we would be willing to miss a meal or meals if it meant our contribution, making our contribution toward balancing our Federal budget. I almost cried when I heard them say that.

Then I talked to the program administrator. The program administrator said: Mr. MICA, we know you have to balance the budget, but let me tell you, when you balance that budget, include in it, as you have done, a proposal that would give us flexibility because we get money and we cannot spend money because of stupid Federal regulations. So do that.

That is what this debate is about. We have allowed that. That is what this holdup is about because we know that the President will not make these program changes. That is one of the program changes.

Then let us talk about Head Start. I have always been an advocate of Head Start. I love Head Start. Who would not want to give a deserving child a head start? Then I looked at the programs in my district, and I almost threw up. Let me tell my colleagues what we do with Head Start. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, and also my colleagues what we do with Head Start.

I have 18 teachers in one program in a community Head Start; not 1 teacher is certified, not one is certified. But we have 11 administrative force for 450 children. This is sick. This is sick, 11 administrators. I thought we would change this. No, you cannot change it because it is required by Federal law and regulations. So our children who need this assistance, what are they getting? They are getting second-class education. That is what this is about, spending more and getting less. I am sick of it.

All right, let me tell you, you could send the kids in my district, you could send them to the best private schools, preschools we have got, and spend less and give the parents a $1,000 check and still come out better. I have not counted the money that they are spending on the administration for Washington and Atlanta and then you impose on our State and locals to administer these programs. I get upset when I hear this.

Then the President has the gall to go before us and say: Environmental Protection Agency, shut down toxic waste. Can you think of a bigger toxic waste program than EPA? The whole program is EPA. I sat on the subcommittee that investigated EPA for 2 years; 85 percent of the money goes for attorney's fees and studies. Even the GAO produced a report, I will show it to anyone that wants to see it. It says toxic waste site cleanups are done on the basis of a political decision, not on the basis of public health and safety and concern for our children.

So, then he goes on and says, lets do this, that EPA's efforts to prevent cryptosporidium from contaminating

water supplies, something that proved deadly, threatened the city of Milwaukee, have been badly delayed, have been badly delayed. First of all, let me tell you about cryptosporidium. It is caused by deer feces. It was caused by deer feces, as I believe.

Let me tell my colleagues about water contamination. Under Federal law and Federal regulation, we looked into this. We investigated it; 54 contaminants are required by law by statute for EPA to investigate. That is what they told us they were doing. They were doing the inflexible thing that Congress mandates that we are trying to change so that we could look at water contamination so that we could spend less and get more instead of the opposite.

Then Medicare contractors who serve our elderly are not being paid. I will tell my colleagues what that debate is about. I come from Florida. We have a billion dollar's worth of contractor fraud in Florida in Medicare and a billion dollar's worth in Medicaid. That is $2 billion. How many elderly could we serve in this Nation if we would eliminate the fraud, waste, and abuse? So that is what this is about, spending more and getting less.

LEAST PRODUCTIVE, MOST DESTRUCTIVE CONGRESS

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we ended the first session of the Republican revolutionary Congress. We heard from a lot of folks that are typical of revolutionaries, full of self-righteous zeal, people who firmly believe that the end justifies the means, people who are almost wholly intolerant of other people's point of view. But let us look inside that first session of the last Congress to see what it actually accomplished.

When we do, we have to come to the conclusion that yesterday marked the last day of the least productive, most destructive session of Congress in our Nation's history. Despite all of the promises, all of the rhetoric, we have virtually nothing to show for it.

I will not go into all the quotes from the various commentators and news sources and experts from both Republican and conservative think tanks alike. They all concur. Loads of rhetoric, loads of promises, virtually no performance. I do not have a fancy chart. I have just a little Xerox copy that tracks the bills from previous sessions of Congress. It used to be that we enacted about 450 bills a year. The last time the Republicans controlled Congress, it dropped to 250 bills. Then it goes along until this last session of the Congress we ended yesterday, and it drops off the cliff.

It looks like the 1929 stock market crash. There is only one bill really in that whole Contract With America that has actually been fully enacted called the Congressional Accountability Act. Do you know what? That bill was passed by the previous Democratic Congress. It was held up by the Republicans in the Senate. So we passed it again. This time it got through the Senate and signed by the President. There have been two other bills, the Unfunded Mandate Act and Paperwork Reduction, both of which the President wanted.

So that is what we have to show for it.

One of those promises that was made in the Contract With America, if the Republican leadership had kept it, we never would be in this position. It would not be the most destructive Congress in our Nation's history. If the Congress had made good on their promise in the Contract With America to pass a line-item veto, the President today would have been able to delete all those extraneous ideological, inappropriate, nongermane provisions in the appropriation bills that have been sent to him. He could clean up the mess, clean up those appropriation bills, enact them and we would be finished with this. Every one of them could have been enacted.

Of course, they would not have been enacted in time. After 10 months of wrangling, almost exclusively between the Republicans in the Senate and the Republicans in the House, we were marginalized. They could not agree among themselves. By the end of the last fiscal year and the beginning of this fiscal year, when those appropriation bills had to be enacted, one had been sent to the President. Do you know which one it was? It was the legislative branch appropriations bill to fund the Congress itself. Thank God President Clinton vetoed it. Imagine if we were the only ones who were funded; none of the rest of the Government but we have taken care of ourselves.

That line-item veto, which was promised in the context of so much rhetoric, is tied up in a conference between the Republicans in the Senate and the Republicans in the House. Let us move it out of conference. Send it to the President. The President could take it. Clean up the appropriation bills. We could open up the Government and get back down to the business of governing. That is what we ought to do. Instead, we are stuck with a new session of Congress that again will be the least productive, most destructive session of Congress in our Nation's history.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us come to the well today, I hope with some reason, to discuss the Government shutdown. Yes, it is devastating and, yes, there are people who should be paid. I support paying them. Yes, we must care about those single parents and single mothers and single gentlemen who are working and have families and married couples who live on marginal incomes. That is very important to small businesses and every one who is being hurt by this.

That is all true. I hope that we will, within this week, come to some resolution. But what bothers me is that the rhetoric here is so shrill, so biting, so negative about this Congress. This House of Representatives has in fact done more of what the people sent us to do than any Congress before it. I do not care how much those who attack the reform movement by calling it revolutionaries or whatever may say. We have done what the American people sent us here to do.

The issue they would like on this side of the aisle clouds the issue. The issue is, when are we going to put America back on a sound financial basis? When are we going to balance the budget? When are we going to have meaningful welfare reform? When are we going to return power to the States and to the individuals? The debate is about basic policy, not about numbers, the debate between this Congress and its leaders and a President who does not want any of those things. So the problem is not just with the Congress; the White House has to take its share of the blame.

Let us review a minute what happened after the last shutdown. We gave the President 30 days. He traveled around the world. He never came to the table until the 15th, when we had another shutdown. So he absolutely blew 30 days when he could have worked with the leadership in this Congress to come to some agreement. Will that happen again if we start the Government up? I certainly hope not. I hope the President has learned a lesson that the American people want the basic issues, they want a balanced budget. They want welfare reform. He promised it. They want to return power to the States. The calls in my district, while they do not support hurting people who are working and not paying them, are strongly for the basic issues here. Balance the budget, welfare reform, do the things that we said we were going to do. People across the country want that. If my colleagues on the other side of the aisle think they can run a campaign next November and win on doing nothing and on blocking the reforms, I think they are sadly, sadly mistaken.

What we want is a President who will negotiate and work with the leadership to come to an agreement. I just want to refer to an article in the paper today. It just says very briefly in the Washington Post that, if the President and leaders of the Republican Congress agree on a plan to balance the budget, the benefits could mean roughly $1,000 a year for every American family. At today's interest rates, the trillion-dollar government debt that would be avoided by a balanced budget would save the taxpayers over the next 7

years $60 billion. It is worth it. It is our children's future. It is the future of this country. I hope the American people will listen to reason. I know that they believe in what we are trying to do.

□ 1515

THIS IS ABOUT REAL PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker, this is a great debate, this is a debate about who is important, who is not. It is a debate, I think, about the future, it is about the future we will allow all Americans to share in, hopefully. But I want to share with my colleagues a letter I received today from a mother of a 10-year-old girl. This letter is about a young girl that lives in Wilmington, my congressional district, with her mother and father. Her mother and father are musicians who have served as ambassadors for the U.S. Information Agency. On December 20 this little girl, 10 years old, traveled to Germany to visit her ailing stepmother, a stepmother who has cancer and is in treatment taking chemotherapy, but this is not where the story ends; it is really where it begins.

Let me read her mother's letter. It is self-explanatory. She writes: I hope you can help. We have a 10-year-old stranded in Germany who is supposed to return home by January 8 and whose passport expired January 2. This mother continued: She is flying Delta from Frankfort to Atlanta, and the Delta Airline international desk has told me that they will not let her board. This concerned mother goes on: The Hamburg consulate has told her father that they cannot issue a new passport due to the shutdown. Then she asks, could you please ask them to make an exception? She is an unaccompanied minor. Mr. Speaker, I enter this letter into the RECORD:

To Eva Clayton:

I have not been able to reach you by phone. I hope you can help. We have a 10 year old stranded in Germany who's supposed to return home Jan. 8th, but whose passport expired Jan. 2nd. She's flying Delta from Frankfort to Atlanta. Delta Airlines International Desk has told me they will not let her board. The Hamburg Consulate has told her father that they cannot issue a new passport due to the shut-down. Could you please ask them to make an exception since she is an unaccompanied minor? We appreciate your help! Thanks

Mr. Speaker, imagine a 10-year-old girl alone, away from her parents, away from school, in a foreign land, and she is told by her government she is not able to go home and she is not able to come to the United States to go back to school. Why? Because its government is closed.

On an average day the State Department processed some 23,000 applications for passports. On this day and each of the days this Government has been shut down no application for passports are being processed. On an average day the State Department issued some 20,000 visas to visitors who spent an average of $3,000 for a total of $60 million, but for this little girl who is 10 years old this is no average day.

They are not just numbers; they are people. When we talk about the common good for the multitude, we must remember those multitudes are made up of individual people who make up this great America.

I intend to do all in my power to help this little girl get home, but I cannot do it alone. We need reasonable people on both sides to understand what we are doing to this Government is foolishness and this needs to stop. But a simple act by this House following the responsible bipartisan act of the Senate where both Republicans and Democrats unanimously say that this Government should be open while we have this great debate. We should do that. All we need now is 20 reasonable Republicans to join with the Democrats on this side to follow the example that the Senate has done. Both Republicans and Democrats have come together to say the Government should go on while we have this great debate.

Do not hold this little girl in hostage. What will we tell her when we come home? What lessons are we teaching her as we do this? What lessons are we exemplifying to the rest of the world, that we cannot have a serious debate unless we hold people who are innocent as leverage, as hostage?

This is no way for responsible people to govern their Nation. Yes, we are not being responsible, Mr. Speaker, because indeed we are making real people suffer, real people, not just some imaginative number of the future, but real people are suffering; senior citizens are suffering, and the prospect of their Meals on Wheels not being there to feed people who desperately need those. We certainly are making people suffer who are eligible for Social Security who cannot even process their application. Why? There is no one there to take the application.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, if that is not bad enough, in this bitter cold season we do not have heat. The heat program that we had made available for what we call the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program is no longer available. No one has that opportunity. In the bitter cold we will say no to those people. Why? Because we want to make them sacrificial lambs.

Mr. Speaker, on this 20th day we hope again we could find 20 reasonable Republicans to join and follow the exemplary bipartisan responsible act of the Senate and put this Government back to work while we have this great debate.

BALANCING THE BUDGET IN 7 YEARS IS NEITHER RADICAL OR EXTREME

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I have two things to say about the budget debate: First, the overwhelming majority of the American people do not believe it is radical or extreme, in any way, to require the Federal Government to balance its budget in 7 years; and second, if this was a Republican President in office, the national media would be pointing out every day and in fact harping on the fact that the President has still not submitted a balanced budget plan some 6 or 7 weeks after he promised to do so.

Apparently he is keeping the Government shut down because he sees partisan political advantage in doing so.

Now on the something else, also related to the budget, and that is the spending of billions and billions of our tax dollars in Rwanda, Haiti, Somalia, and now Bosnia.

Anyone who opposed all this waste has been insulted with the description of isolationist, even if that description was totally inaccurate and even if they wanted trade and friendly relations with all nations. It is just not politically correct or fashionable today to be an isolationist.

That is why I read with such great interest a syndicated column this past Tuesday by Charley Reese, which I include for the RECORD.

Mr. Reese does not live inside the beltway, and he frequently writes with such great commonsense that he is about as plain spoken and politically incorrect as you can get these days.

Time will not permit me to read all of his column, but I would like to read most of it. These are words you do not often hear in Washington, at least in polite company.

The column previously referred to is as follows:

[From The Sentinel, Jan. 2, 1996]

(By Charley Reese)

Those of us who oppose squandering American flesh and treasure in foreign places where we have no national interests are called isolationists by the internationalists.

That's OK. It is intended as an insult, as when Alan Ladd called Jack Palance a ''low-down lying Yankee dog'' in Shane. We Americans understand that because the internationalists are too embarrassed (or afraid of prosecution) to tell the truth, they have no choice but to resort to name-calling and wind-bagging to rationalize these misadventures.

Wind-bagging is when you toss out a lot of undefinable words and phrases such as ''saving America's soul,'' ''maintaining American leadership,'' ''preserving stability,'' or ''moral obligation.''

It would be embarrassing indeed if the internationalists were forced to explain why they have a moral obligation to intervene in a foreign civil war while they feel no moral obligation at all to tell the American people the truth, rebuild their infrastructure or balance their budget.

. . . Washington said ''It is our policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world. The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is in extending commercial relations to have with them as little political connection as possible.''

America prospered under that policy and could prosper under it again. Why do Americans have to defend 300 million Europeans from 150 million bankrupt Russians? That's the question Pat Buchanan asks, and it's a question Americans ought to ask of every internationalist politician. Why do Americans have to enforce peace in Bosnia? Why do Americans have to finance peace treaties in the Middle East? Why do Americans have to rebuild Bosnia when (a) we didn't tear it up, and (b) our own cities need rebuilding?

Medal of Honor winner and Marine Gen. Smedley Butler, who became an isolationist, said, ''I spent 33 years [in the Marines] * * * most of my time being a high-class muscleman for big business, for Wall Street and the bankers. In short, I was a racketeer for capitalism.''

What we isolationists are in favor of are: peace, friendly relations with all countries, trade, independence and respect for the independence of others, American prosperity, American liberty and American security. We are also in favor of sound war-making capability to defend America, and no place else.

GINGRICH PLAN TO HOLD HOSTAGE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES IN THE BUDGET DEBATE IS NO PROFILE IN COURAGE.

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

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference between courage and kidnapping. Courage is sacrificing oneself for a cause. On the other hand, kidnapping is sacrificing someone else for a person's self-interest.

I would suggest that the Gingrich plan to use Federal employees as hostages in the budget debate is far more akin to kidnapping than to courage. It is no profile in courage to sacrifice innocent victims for someone's own cause, and that is exactly what the Speaker and his supporters in the House have done. They are getting their congressional paychecks while they are stopping innocent Federal employees from getting theirs. That is not courage, that is hypocrisy at its worst.

The issue before us is not whether we should balance the budget. I support that. That is an important cause. The issue before us is how we will balance the budget over the next 7 years, and the Gingrich Republicans have no right to use Federal employees, hundreds of thousands of them and their families, to force upon this country their own particular plan. If the Gingrich budget cannot withstand the light of day, if it cannot stand on its own in an open public debate in our democracy, then it would be morally wrong to pass that budget simply because it is the only way to free hundreds of thousands of Federal employees. Hostage taking, kidnapping, and blackmail have absolutely no place in a free society.

Mr. Speaker, I think Senator DOLE, the majority leader of the other party, a Member of the Republican Party, leader of the Senate, was right when he said enough is enough. I do not see any sense in what we have been doing. Let me repeat that. Senator DOLE said, ''I don't see any sense in what we've been doing. I would hope that we would have quick action in the House. People have been gone from their jobs long enough. Enough is enough.''

BOB DOLE was right. NEWT GINGRICH and his supporters in this House are wrong. We should pass a clean continuing resolution and immediately reopen the Federal Government.

We are not talking about statistics and numbers here, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about real people with real families. Let me tell you about some of those from our district who have written me:

Dear sir, I am scheduled to be in surgery for colon cancer on the 3rd of January. Because of the government shutdown I have not been able to resolve the question of income. This thing has put my life savings in the toilet, so I don't have the money to come for the surgery. Since this thing is going to wipe out my career if I can't get some type disability, I'm going to be the only homeless person with an oxygen bottle for emphysema and a colostomy for colon cancer. I don't find much quality of life here. I have paid into Social Security since 1954. I also served in the U.S. military for 8.5 years. I find it a bad situation when I can't get any help. At 56 I'm too young to retire and too old to be retrained.

□ 1530

A veteran in my district, Mr. Speaker, who served his country in the military for 8½ years, cannot get any help for colon cancer because of the shutdown, the unnecessary, unfair shutdown of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is fine and it is healthy and it is good for us to debate a balanced budget and how we are going to get there. We should have that debate. My feeling is whether that debate takes 2 days or 2 weeks or 2 months longer, it is better that we do it right than to do it under the blackmail threat of shutting down hundreds of thousands of Federal employees from receiving their paychecks.

Another real person with a real family in my district, who is a victim of the Gingrich strategy:

Dear Representative EDWARDS: Both my husband and I are employed at the Central Texas Medical Center in Temple, Texas. Because we both work for the VA, an underfunded Federal agency. We will receive only one-half of our paychecks on January 2. My car is five years old. We saved $1,100 to put into a badly needed transmission. Fortunately, we have that money to get us through this pay period. It do not know what we would have done if it were not for that. I cry every night when I watch the news because I am so angry and worried.

We have another constituent that wrote, ''Dear Mr. EDWARDS. I was furloughed for two weeks even though I was told purchasing agents were essential on December 28, 1995. I am a single parent, and I am not whining about this, I am very proud of it, but there is no second income in my family.''

It is time to put Federal workers back to work.

ONE TRILLION DOLLARS MORE IS TOO MUCH

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the Dole campaign is going to be very pleased with all of the support he is getting from across the aisle in the Democrat Party. I hope they will attend the fundraisers and help Senator DOLE gain the Presidency of the United States, because I think he is a good leader, which is demonstrated right here by the support that he is getting from the Democrat party.

Although I currently disagree with the policy he has on this continuing resolution, I still see him as a fine leader, and the type of man that I want for President of the United States; and I am glad to see many of the members of the Democrat Party on the other side of the aisle join with us in their support for Majority Leader DOLE over President Clinton on this.

I want to move on to something else, though, because I am really wondering how long the President is going to tolerate what is going on. I am wondering how long Congress is going to tolerate what is going on. I am wondering how long the American people are going to tolerate what is going on, even though we are finally talking about a balanced budget.

Now, we have been talking about a balanced budget a long time here in Congress. Ever since the 104th Congress has been going on, we have been very specifically targeting a balanced budget that would take 7 years to achieve. But now we are seeing a very dramatic change. The President is talking about it; even the liberals here in Congress are talking about it. But the President still wants to spend $1 trillion more over the next 7 years than Congress does, $1 trillion.

Now, that is a lot of money. To give you some kind of an idea how much money it is, if you were to have gone in business the day after Christ rose from the dead and you lost $1 million that day and every day up until today, almost 2,000 years, you would only be about 80 percent of the way to losing $1 trillion. That is only $800 billion that you would have lost.

One trillion dollars is a lot of money, and that is what the President wants to spend over what Congress has put in their budget. Do you ever wonder why?

There are some liberal organizations the President obviously supports that do not have the support of the majority of this Congress, like the national bureaucracy for the Education Association, our current welfare bureaucracy. We here in Congress would like to send the solution or the money closer to the

problems and let the States deal with it. They are doing it very well in the State of Kansas where I come from, and I have confidence in Governor Graves and Rochelle Chronister, the Secretary of Rehabilitation Services. They are doing a very good job.

What we have seen here is something very ineffective. Particularly agencies like the Department of Energy have been horribly mismanaged. Secretary O'Leary, the Secretary of the Department of Energy, has become a focal point because of her travel, but this is just the tip of the iceberg.

It started last year when we were looking at different agencies. The General Accounting Office said that the Department of Energy was ineffective as a Cabinet-level agency. Vice President GORE in his National Performance Review said that they were 40 percent ineffective in the environmental management area, and it was going to cost taxpayers $70 billion over the next 30 years unless we do something about it.

Then we found out about the public relations office. The Department of Energy hires over 500 public relations employees at a cost of about $25 million to taxpayers. Secretary O'Leary has a personal media consultant that she hires. She has even hired a private investigative firm to develop a list of unfavorable reporters and Congressmen so that she can ''work on these people a little.''

Let us focus a little bit on her travel, because today in the Subcommittee on General Oversight and Investigations, we found out that Secretary O'Leary has taken over 100 domestic and international trips. Now, some of this travel is needed, particularly in the domestic area, because that is where the Secretary of Energy's responsibilities lie. But the international travel, 16 trips, are outside the scope of her requirements as Secretary of the Department of Energy.

The GAO, the General Accounting Office, looked at two specific trips. One was to South Africa and one was to India. Now, this is reported in the Washington Times today. The trip to South Africa included 135 persons, 63 from the Department of Energy and 72 from the business and academic areas. It cost taxpayers about $1 million, $1,860,000, over $1 million.

The second trip to India had 37 people from the Government and 41 guests. It cost $729,000. One of the interesting things about this is that according to Chairman BARTON from Texas, the Department of Energy charged these non-DOE visitors, these guests, $2,800 for coach fare on this, but the actual cost to taxpayers was $12,860.

So who is going to make up that $10,000? Well, the taxpayers are making it up, and I think it is kind of a sad state of affairs.

Second, we found out that Secretary O'Leary has transferred $400,000 from a nuclear weapons-related account over to her travel budget so she can make these trips.

What it all boils down to, Mr. Speaker, is that we must balance the budget. We must remove Secretary O'Leary; we must eliminate the Department of Energy as a Cabinet-level agency. Let us get the Government back to work, cull the deadwood out by eliminating the Department of Energy.

FRESHMEN NOT READY TO LEAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor this afternoon to express my very, very deep concerns about what is happening here in Washington, DC. It is absolutely amazing. This is the most extraordinary occurrence that I or anybody else could possibly witness at this time.

We have right here in the Congress of the United States a group of Members, elected by the people, being led by the newest Members of Congress, the freshmen; being led by the newest group with the least experience, who have decided to shut down Government. They have decided they do not care whether or not children are hurt, families are hurt; they do not care whether or not Social Security claims can be processed; whether or not our prisons are secured with employees who are working there who should be paid. They do not care about any of that.

They have come here not understanding the seriousness of their actions, and they have decided to try and hold this Congress hostage to their demands. It is a kind of immature action; nobody expects policymakers to respond in this manner.

One could ask, well, what has happened in the past? What happens when there are disagreements? What happens when you get to the point where the Government has run out of money and you have not resolved your differences? Well, I want you to know, until this Congress, it has always been worked out.

Even under Ronald Reagan, when there were serious differences between Republicans and Democrats, they had to hammer it out. They had to work it out. Nobody took their tent and closed it up and ran home and said, I do not care what happens. I do not care whether the services of Government are carried out or not. I do not want to play anymore.

Well, I want to tell you, I am utterly stunned and surprised that we have this group of new Members leading some of the more seasoned Members with this kind of catastrophe. It is unheard of. What are the people thinking out there, aside from those who are not getting paid, where the services are not getting delivered?

You must understand that the people are paying taxes. Nobody has stopped the people's taxes while this madness is going on. But what are they paying for? Many of them are not getting the services that the taxes should be buying them.

I wonder about my Republican friends who claim they are concerned about the best use of the taxpayers' money. I am concerned that they are doing two things, maybe more: No. 1, they are having people work, they are having people work, some of whom I suppose will get paid sometime later on. We do not know. But many of them are being asked to work without knowing whether or not they are going to get paid.

Some of them have been disadvantaged already. They have gotten partial paychecks. I am concerned about that. I am also concerned about the attitudes, this extremism.

Do you know what Pete Wilson said the other day when he was asked for some help? Pete Wilson, the Governor up in California, up in this county called Mariposa, where they depend on the tourism trade because of Yosemite, they said they had a state of emergency because their economy has fallen apart because of what these young Republican Members are doing; and so they asked Pete Wilson for some help.

Pete Wilson turned them down, said the State of California could not help them; but then he had some advice for them. The Governor of the State of California, Pete Wilson, said, go break the locks on the gates. Let them in, he said. Defy the law. Commit a criminal act, he said.

Irresponsible leadership, but of course, NEWT GINGRICH and others have said, they do not care if they close Government down. All of this irrational leadership.

Mr. MICA was just on the floor and he talked about Head Start, and it was obvious he knew very little about Head Start and how it really works. I know a lot about Head Start, and I know why it is important.

Let me just wrap up by saying that the leadership and what is going on on the Republican side of the aisle is absolutely unconscionable. They are devastating lives. I think the people understand what is going on.

BLAME GAME DOES NOT BALANCE THE BUDGET

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, let me just share a little bit different perspective.

First of all, I think to hear Members from this side of the aisle get up and blame the President for the shutdown and Members on the other side get up and blame the Republican Congress, we get an understanding of why things are not working around here. It seems like nobody says they want a train wreck, but the President would love to have it down here at the Capitol steps. Some of our Members would like to have it down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. In the meanwhile, nothing gets done.

Let us talk frankly about what it would take to open up this Government. Four things could happen. First of all, the President could sign the appropriations bills that we sent him. He has signed a number of those bills. He has vetoed three and sent them back. The Interior appropriations bill we tried to override today, our second option if he does not sign those bills that would put people to work and put the Government to work, which is his prerogative under the Constitution, is that we can see if we have enough votes to muster a veto override. That takes two-thirds votes.

We voted on the Interior appropriations today. I think it was a reasonable bill. I did not like all parts of it. We had rejected that bill twice on environmental grounds, tried to make it a little better each time. The President vetoed it knowing, in the meantime, that this bill would have put 133,000 people to work; it would have opened up the national parks, the Smithsonian; it would have put the U.S. Geological Survey back to work. I have 1,000 workers in Reston that are furloughed at this time, so that they could do their work.

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

Mr. DAVIS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I just want to make a point, a point that has been missed here. I have been around here for a long time, and this body has been here for a long time. It is the President's prerogative to veto bills. This should have been worked out for your sake, and I know how special this is to you because of all of your people that are here. A clean CR is not going to stop the negotiations on the budget.

□ 1545

I just do not understand why we make the balanced budget hold these people hostage of something that is going to happen 7 years down the road.

Mr. DAVIS. Reclaiming my time, let me just say to my friend, we have had 57 continuing resolutions since 1980 between the House and Senate. Most of those were with a Democratic Congress and a Republican President.

How many of those CR's were clean CR's? Many of them were not. The Boland amendment which forbade aid to the Contras was put on a continuing resolution. We even put roads and the New Jersey Turnpike into the Federal Highway System on a continuing resolution. There is a loss of surplusage and riders in these. I am not defending, and I would like to see a clean CR. I was one of two Members on this side of the aisle who voted with you yesterday to bring up a clean CR. I am going to get to that in a minute.

But no one can sit here and say, ''Gee, let's do a clean CR'' when you all were on the other side and we had a Republican President you very often did not send a clean CR at the same time.

Mr. HEFNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Just for a second, because I want to make a few points.

Mr. HEFNER. We are talking about past history, and you folks were elected saying, ''We're going to change things around here.'' But this is not changing things for the better. This is human misery. VA hospitals in North Carolina. These people are in dire circumstances.

Mr. DAVIS. Reclaiming my time, I do not disagree with the gentleman. I think what has happened here is a national disgrace. But to put it on one side or one party is, I think, a big mistake. I think that is part of our problem, is we end up too much time pointing fingers at each other and too little time working together and working these issues out.

Let me just get back to the Interior appropriations bill again. This bill I think had a number of good items. I think the President, part of him wanted to sign this. I know the Vice President urged him not to. We could still fix this bill. I think we have time to come back and fix this bill in a reasonable period of time and get these people back to work.

Some of the other appropriation bills that have been brought forward, I think, need a little more fixing and we need some time.

The President could have signed these bills, would have put people to work in fairness, Congress could have overridden the vetoes, the votes are not here to do that, so next comes to the continuing resolution.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. I would be happy to yield, but I want to make a few points, I only have 5 minutes, I say to my friend from California.

Ms. ESHOO. I thank the gentleman for yielding. The point that I want to raise, the gentleman understands the dilemma that we are in.

You just said that this is a national disgrace. Putting any fault or blame aside, can you work to find 20 votes in your caucus to open up the Government, Republican votes?

We have 198 on our side and I think that you, being as reasonable and moderate as you are, that there would be 19 others?

Mr. DAVIS. Let me say to my friend that may be able to happen in time. We will have a discharge petition. But 30 days have to run. The problem with this recess is that you do not get the legislative days run during that time. Eventually this will happen, I think, if we could get it to the floor, it or something close to it would pass.

Ms. ESHOO. But 20 votes would stop that recess, and we could open up the Government, and we could move on.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, that would do it, but it does not solve some of the other problems. A continuing resolution is not a resolution. There are still a lot of issues at play in the continuing resolution that frankly ought to be worked out.

Ms. ESHOO. Of course there are. They have to be negotiated.

Mr. DAVIS. Let me just make a couple of final points.

It also does not get us to a balanced budget which is something else that I think needs to be done that we feel very strongly.

The fourth thing that could happen is the President could put a balanced budget on the table and we would get a continuing resolution like that. I think that onus is on the President. Both sides are at play here. I think we could all do a better job.

PASSAGE OF CONTINUING RESOLUTION URGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there are really any Members of this House of Representatives today that can feel very proud about having shut down the Government and causing all the pain and suffering, the many thousands of workers whose families were not able to have a Christmas or a New Year's celebration, and as they sit at home today, have no idea what the Congress is about to do with respect to their jobs. They want to go back to work. For those individuals who are working and who have been designated as essential workers, they are not being paid because their agencies have not been funded and their funds have already run out. The suffering among the workers is tremendous. I was home for a brief few days during our Christmas recess and heard from many workers.

The tragedy is that this is all absolutely unnecessary. The majority party wanted to make a point in November, and the point was that they were determined that the 7-year balanced budget was their priority and they were going to hang on to it no matter what. Even if it was necessary to close down the Government, they were determined to force the President to negotiate.

Those negotiations have taken place. They have not yet yielded the results that the majority party wants, but in point of fact these meetings have occurred. There is absolutely no reason to tie together the annual appropriations, which the Constitution says is the absolute requirement of this Congress to do, to tie it together to a 7-year plan. The 7-year plan is an entirely different, separate concept which the Republicans are saying is important because we have to have a plan in order to enable us to know what to do in the next fiscal year and the fiscal year after that and so forth until the year 2002.

But the reason that portions of the Government are shut down now is not because of the failure to have an agreement on the 7-year balanced budget. It

is because of the failure of the majority party to act in accordance with law in reporting out the appropriation bills for all of the Government operations.

As a matter of fact, on October 1, which is the statutory deadline for the appropriation bills to be done, the majority had not accomplished even a single one except for the Congress. So then immediately they passed a continuing resolution, a clean resolution in which they permitted the Government to go about its business and to take care of all of the programs in effect, and that had a cutoff date of November 14.

At midnight, then, the Government was shut down because there was no further agreement to continue the functions of those agencies that had not yet had appropriation bills, which were 13. Thirteen of the appropriation bills had not cleared even by midnight of November 13.

So we had a short shutdown of 5 or 6 days during that period, when again there was a continuing resolution, this time with a club over the President's head, saying, ''We are only going to agree to this continuing resolution until December 15, and we want you to agree that you will come and support the concept of a balanced budget in the year 2002,'' which he has done. There are negotiations going on.

This business of using terrorist tactics and holding innocent people hostage, because someone decided that their ideas about the future of this country are so important and so paramount that the suffering of the people across the country is irrelevant, to me that is an unconscionable way to perform your public responsibilities as given to us under the Constitution.

It is so simple for us to consider a continuing resolution. It has been done in the Senate. Their own Senate leader has put together a continuing resolution. Why not just pass that continuing resolution, let our workers for these remaining nine Departments go back to work and service the communities that are so desperately in need?

My community depends upon the tourist business, we depend upon the parks, we depend upon many other facilities that are operated by the Federal Government. It is tragic that these entities that are really public services are closed down and innocent people, not connected to anyone here, not connected to the Federal Government, are being caused all this harm and suffering. It is time to allow the Government to go back to work.

BALANCED BUDGET WILL RETURN FISCAL SANITY TO WASHINGTON

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I think it is particularly important not to lose track of the overall focus of what we have got to do with the Government in Washington, DC. That is, we have got to bring fiscal sanity back to this city. Right now this government is adding to the debt at a rate of $30 million an hour. Thirty million an hour goes out more than comes in. The answer is not in additional taxes.

I just heard the previous speaker say we are holding the children of this country hostage, or innocent people hostage. Hostage? We are holding this entire country hostage and the next generation hostage to a deficit that has got to become controlled. There is not a family in America that runs their budget like this budget has been run for 40 years.

Sure, we have had 20 days of discomfort up here. But this country has had 40 years of discomfort. You cannot continue to use this congressional voting card, which is the most unused credit card in the history of this country, you cannot continue to accumulate deficit after deficit after deficit.

There are going to be some adjustments. There are changes that need to be made. Anytime we take business as usual in Washington, DC. and change it and make it more sane and make it more common sense, it is going to cause a disruption. Do not let that disruption divert attention away from a balanced budget. Our country needs one.

I think it is fair to address some of the hardships that some Federal employees are facing as a result of their pay being delayed. They are all going to be paid. Let there be no question about that. They will be paid. The question is the delay. And are there hardships? Certainly there are going to be some hardships.

Let me tell the Members what we did in Colorado. On New Year's Day, a local banker by the name of Bob Young, Robert Young with Alpine Banks called me at my home, and we talked and fine-tuned a program. His bank, the day after New Year's Day, announced that all Federal employees could go to the Alpine banking system in Colorado and draw interest-free an amount equal to the net amount of their last paycheck, so they will not miss any payments. Alpine Banks is committed to do this during this period of shutdown. Since then we have gotten banks in Pueblo, CO, the Minnequa Bank, and a bank in Durango, CO, the Burns Bank, and we have been in contact with many other banks to also join this program.

We want to work with those people. We want to help them with these hardships. But the minute we put this Government back to business as usual, we take the pressure off the Speaker of the House, we take the pressure off the President of the Senate and we take the pressure off the President of the United States to negotiate an agreement.

The only reason these people are negotiating right now is because of the pressure that society is putting on them, partially because the Government is closed down, but more importantly because this Government continues to spend without control.

Finally, let me say this. I have heard a lot of speakers on the other side of the aisle criticizing our attempt for a balanced budget. I hope some of the Members speak as strongly about Hazel O'Leary's disappearance of several hundred thousand dollars. They have an opportunity to come to some of these committee hearings and ask Hazel O'Leary:

How come you spent $500,000 to charter a private jet to go overseas? How come you have an advance team of 31 people? How come you have a film crew follow you all around the world?

There is a lot of waste in this budget. Use your time today that you are devoting to attacking the Republican Party, take that time and take a look at the waste that we have got in our budget. We can work on this as a team.

I am optimistic we can get an agreement. But let me say, the most crucial thing we can do in this generation is to hand the next generation a balanced budget. I urge each and every one of you to join us as a team and give America the biggest present they could have, and that is a balanced budget for the next generation.

IN MEMORY OF ANNE NOEL FAZIO

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a more somber note than the debate that has been going on here today. I rise under special orders on this day, January 4, which would have been the birthday of my younger sister Nancy, had it not been for the tragic death of Nancy when she was killed visiting me when I was a Peace Corps volunteer. But I rise not so much to remember her. I did that when I was sworn into office in this Chamber just a few years ago. But I rise to talk about death, because it has come to one of our colleague's family.

□ 1600

Today I ask this country to share my empathy with our truly distinguished colleague, VIC FAZIO. He lost his youngest daughter, Anne Noel.

Everyone knows how hard VIC works in this institution. He is one of the hardest working Members that we have and certainly one of the most devoted Members to the institution of the House of Representatives. VIC is totally dedicated. But most important, or more important than his leadership, is his family.

Today, in Sacramento, as we sit here in Washington, a memorial service is being conducted for his and Joey's daughter. She was a star. She fought off leukemia with a successful bone marrow transplant. She graduated from McClatchey High School. She earned a degree from the University of

California at Davis, where she was president of her sorority.

To Anne Noel's parents, VIC and Joey, there is nothing more painful than that of the pain of losing a child. But I know from my own sister's death that you need time to grieve, and in your grief this country shares what you have so effectively done in leading this Nation ahead, and that is that this country shares your sorrow.

We send this sorrow to you as Representatives of this Nation's Government, who knows that VIC not only has led this Congress but he has been a great father who is now suffering from the most difficult pain of all, the pain of the loss of a child.

VIC, we pray for you. But most of all, we send our love.

I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO].

Ms. ESHOO. I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], for organizing this small but very important tribute to Anne Fazio.

As my colleague has just stated, Anne was a star. All of her doctors, anyone that knew her, her friends, her extended family of friends knew what a fighter she was. She fought leukemia, and she was a real champion. There were many times where she felt, as VIC said, her father, that she had been dealt a bad deck of cards, and her father, being the fighter that he is, reminded her time and time again to look at what she had done with what was dealt to her.

She excelled at everything that she did, and we know most of all, as parents, the most difficult thing, the most unbearable thing, the most unthinkable is for a parent to have to bury their own child.

So today in this Chamber, we gather as the friends and colleagues of the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO]. It makes no difference whether one is a Republican or a Democrat. We reach out, and we say, as parents and as friends, we grieve with you. You have our prayers. We know that the angels have welcomed Anne to heaven, but it is up to us to do God's work and to continue on and to take care of one another as friends and extend ourselves in sympathy.

I would like to just close on this note: I cannot help but think of the writings of Milton at this time, and he wrote that, ''And so she passed on, and all the trumpets sounded on the other side.''

God rest her gentle young soul, and we send you our best, VIC, and when you get back here we will surround you with our friendship, with our love and our prayers.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI].

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], for taking this time for us to express the condolences and the sympathy of all Members of this body to the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] and his family for his tremendous loss.

I also wanted to say that our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO], expressed so well the sentiments that we all share. She was the head of the prayer patrol for Anne in the Congress, and we were all alerted a couple of months ago that more prayers were needed, and we did not realize, though, how drastically.

I would like to say, as I say my colleagues have said it so eloquently, but I just want to say a couple of things about Anne. She was only 2 years old when VIC was elected to the Congress, and she worked as a volunteer in her father's office and became very acquainted with politics. She had an interest in public service and she was a page in the summer of 1988.

VIC and Anne's mother described her best when VIC said, ''Anne had an indomitable spirit and a tremendous amount of will,'' a tearful VIC FAZIO said on Monday. Her mother said she was a wonderful daughter and a wonderful friend.

We all shared VIC's concern over the years when Anne was fighting leukemia, and she proved herself a trouper, a fighter, and as my two colleagues have said, a star.

Any words of consolation to someone who has lost a child are, of course, inadequate and, in fact, impossible. But I hope it is a consolation to VIC and to Joey, Carolyn Mason, Anne's mother, I hope it is a consolation to them we all learned a great deal from Anne in her courage and her strength. She was an inspiration to many people in the Congress of the United States and all who knew her, and I hope they are consoled by the fact that her life was appreciated, that she left this Earth as a teacher, as an inspiration, and that she is remembered in the prayers of all Members of the Congress of the United States.

Again, I thank our colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR], and the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ESHOO] for their words of inspiration and again extend our deepest, deepest sympathy to VIC FAZIO and his family.

EXPRESSING CONDOLENCES TO THE FAZIO FAMILY

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me extend to our good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], and his family from the Republican side of the aisle our sincerest condolences on the death of his daughter, Anne.

I cannot imagine what it would be like to lose a daughter or a son, but I certainly do not want to experience that. So we wish VIC the very best and his family the very best, and they get all of our deepest sympathy.

TRIBUTE TO RUSSELL W. BROWN

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, the reason I am taking this 5-minute special order is because in 1964, I met a fellow who was to become one of my dearest friends, and he died day before yesterday of cancer, and he became like a brother to me.

I remember in 1970, when I first decided to run for Congress, I talked him into getting involved in politics. He said, ''Oh my gosh,'' he says, ''I wouldn't want to do that. It takes too much time. There is so much crookedness and corruption,'' you know what people say. I talked him into it. His name was Russell W. Brown, incidentally. He became one of the political leaders in Indianapolis, IN, and the State of Indiana for 30 years.

I do not know what our party or the political process would have done had we not had such a person in a leadership position in Indianapolis. He was an inspiration to everybody. He spent a tremendous amount of time, as both sides of the aisle know, working for various candidates, making sure that their views were expressed and they got elected.

Those people are the unsung heroes. We get elected and we get on television and people around the country find out who we are. They may not agree with us, but at least we get some notoriety. But people like Russ Brown, who spent 15, 20, 30, 40 hours a week working on our behalf and on behalf of the country, the Nation, never getting much recognition. But they certainly deserve it. Without them, the foot soldiers, the people who are the political leaders back home, without them we would not be elected and the country would not be able to get its job done, and the Congress would not be able to get its job done.

I would just like to say today, and I guess I am kind of rambling, Mr. Speaker, I normally do not do that, I guess, I am certainly going to miss Russ. He was a wonderful man. He was a great humanitarian, a great father, a great husband, and he was one of my dearest friends, and throughout the remainder of my life, I will miss his smiling face, and his words of encouragement, and all the wonderful things he did for me and for this country.

PEOPLE ARE BEING BADLY HURT BY THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, real people are being hurt and hurt badly by this Government shutdown.

I want to tell you about a lady who called this morning extremely upset and concerned about what was going to happen to her family. Her name is Rita Arrington. She is a nurse at the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Lake

City, FL. She is the only breadwinner in her family because her husband is disabled. She had a child to feed and clothe. She has bills to pay just like you and me.

But for the last 20 days she has worked without pay because she is an essential Federal employee, and, get this, because of title 38, she is barred from working in a nursing home or some other facility in her off hours so that she could receive some compensation.

I have gotten many, many calls from Federal employees in my district. Many work in the area of VA medical centers. They are working without pay, without any sort of financial security. Like all of us, they do have those bills to pay, children to feed and mortgages to pay, and we sit here continuing with our partisan bickering for the 20th day in a row.

This is not what we were sent here to do. Our job is to ensure the responsible functioning of Government, and I cannot think of anything more irresponsible than to let these workers continue to work without pay for 1 more day.

Mr. Speaker, veterans in my district depend on these health care workers, and they in turn depend on us. They elected us to represent them.

Who really believes we are doing what we were sent here to do? A great nation does not act this way. We can place blame on the extremists and the liberals, but I am sick of it, and my constituents are sick of it.

We may have our philosophical differences up here. But there is no reason why our Nation's Federal workers and Americans who depend on this Government should be used as political pawns. We can continue to debate our political differences, but how dare we threaten the livelihood of those health care workers who care for men and women who, through their life service, provide us with the very security and freedom we now enjoy?

Today, the fourth continuing resolution ended, and there is currently no legislation providing funding for the VA. We must return Government to work and the people it serves.

Things have gotten so bad that Bread of the Mighty Food Bank in Gainesville is now offering food assistance to furloughed employees of the veterans' medical center in Gainesville so they do not go hungry.

It is a shame, and it is a shame brought on by this House.

Then there is the young mother from High Springs. She was receiving disability but is now attending the University of Florida under vocational rehabilitation funding. Because of the shutdown of the Government, she is unable to pay her tuition. This was to be her final semester. She was looking forward to entering the work force and becoming a productive citizen. Now she will have to attend an extra semester, delaying her ability to get a job and provide for her family.

If this is not bad enough, she has a young son who is disabled, who is also being affected. Now, because of the shutdown and lack of assistance she was receiving her son will lose the attention he was receiving from a qualified professional at home.

To those who do not believe there is a disastrous ripple effect from the shutdown, let me assure you that there is. The qualified caregiver that was helping this young woman's son is also a mother herself. She is not getting paid either. This mother also has to feed her family.

When is this going to end? I am now asking, please, from this leadership, let us present a clean CR. Let us not go a single more day advancing financial and emotional hardship on our work force. Let us face it, many have lost faith in Congress over the past 20 days. It is time, and moreover it is our responsibility to set aside our differences just for 15 minutes. That is the time it would take to vote for a clean CR and agree to put our Federal workers back to work.

SUMMARY OF 4-DAY TRIP IN GERMANY

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

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not yet asked permission to reduce my 1-hour special order later tonight to 5 minutes, so I will do that at this moment and take that 1-hour special order tomorrow night.

Mr. Speaker, I have just returned yesterday afternoon in time to make the attempted overriding of Mr. Clinton's pathetic vetoing of a great defense authorization bill yesterday. I came back from 4 days in Germany. If it were not for these votes yesterday, today and tomorrow, I would have pressed on to Tuzla to keep my promise that I had hoped to be with the troops Christmas, and when voting prevented that, I said I would be with them at least at their departure points over New Year's, and I was. I would like to give a full hour report on that, but I will do a 5-minute summary tonight.

First of all, on all the acrimony here in the Congress, and as someone who is expecting any day the glory of a 10th grandchild, I understand the pain of insecurity of all the Federal workers who would rather productively be on the job than wondering, even though I suspect they know in the end they will get their pay, but wondering if something can go wrong and they would not be fully recompensed for this unwanted furlough or vacation.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is suffering taking place by American citizens, some very young ones, that goes far beyond the angst and the uncertainty and the suffering of our Federal workers here, and that is those on the Federal payroll in the United States military in Germany and Hungary and in Bosnia.

Let me give you just a short sampling of what I am going to talk about tomorrow. We talked about the land mines on this floor for about a month, but particularly with some intensity the week before Christmas. John Martin Begosh, kind of an unusual, I think it is an Irish name, not exactly what you would say when you would step on a land mine, but Begosh, young John Martin, named after his dad's kid brother, who was killed in Vietnam, suffered a life changing injury.

The military tried to put their best reports on this, but by the third day when I was over there, they finally admitted severe bone loss, part of his foot gone, and his surgeon said he will be disabled for the rest of his life, and in the coming days we will know how badly disabled.

Now, we all pray that he is the exception. As I said on the House floor a couple of weeks ago, I expect very few casualties. I did not join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle predicting a nightmare. I know the efficiency of our military and how all three sides over there, Bosnian Serbs, Bosnian Moslems, and Bosnian Croats, are going to respect the power of our military.

We have something called a target acquisition radar, that when one of those evil mortars or artillery pieces that have been killing civilians fires at us, if and when they dare to, we will know the precise location of the artillery piece or the mortar before the round has barely reached what they are shooting at, and there will be unleashed upon them such accurate 155 millimeter artillery fire, we will not need air support, they will all be dead, and it will be a warning to the others you do not fool with the U.S. military.

That does not mean that the cold and land mines are not beyond every description, including my own, in this House over the last 2 months. At the railheads in Hungary, we have men and women who have been sleeping in railroad cars in filth and rats in the warehouses at these spots, and in cold that is rivaling the severest winter since what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS] saw with the 101st Airborne in the winter of 1944–45.

It is particularly tough on the women. For those of us in this Chamber and the other body that said that women could take any kind of combat, I brought home for tomorrow night comments from women from Stars and Stripes that say it is OK for the men to go relieve themselves in the field, but where are the toilet facilities for we women? It is a little bit different for us.

Down at Tuzla, these freezing nights and these tent facilities and sleeping in and around the vehicles was beyond their worst expectations. But can they cut it? You bet.

I had never in all of my adult life, 6 years active duty, 22 in the reserves, and 18 years, 19 years now, going out to see our troops as a U.S. Congressman, I had never seen more dedicated, gung

ho, professional enlisted men and women and NCO's and an officer corps ready to do the job.

However, do they feel some hurt that the Commander in Chief is using them politically? That we do not see on the television news or in the newspaper reports. You bet they do. To a man they feel they are being used, and I will talk about that tomorrow.

WHAT IT IS LIKE TO BE IN WASHINGTON

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, when I go home, especially over the last Christmas break, people ask me, well, how do you like being in Congress? Is it an honor? Is it fun? Are you going to receptions? What is it like to be in Washington?

Often I respond by telling them a story about my Uncle Oly and Aunt Lena. I, like many in Minnesota, am of Norwegian ancestry. And Oly and Lena one morning were in the house and Oly got up, excused himself, went out to the outhouse, and did his business. As he pulled up his bib overalls, a couple quarters dropped out and went down the hole. Oly was disgusted. He took off his watch and he threw that down, and he took out his wallet and threw that down as well.

He went back in the house and Lena said well, ''Oly, what is wrong with you? You are in such a foul mood and you don't smell so good either. What you been doing?'' And finally it came out. Oly explained to her that he had lost the quarters and thrown his watch and wallet, and she said, ''Oly, why did you do that? Why can you go down there?'' He said, ''Well, you didn't think I was going to go down after just 50 cents, did you?''

Well, there may be some humor in what Uncle Oly did, but there is little humor in what we are about here in Washington. We have all been regaled with stories about the shutdown, its impact on innocent Federal employees, about individuals that need passports to attend funerals, its impact on servicemen, national parks, veterans who are seeking guarantees for loans, businesses that are seeking guarantees from the Small Business Administration, and a vast array of others in America.

It is truly a tragic situation. And the best I can say to folks at home is it is a highly frustrating experience to serve in Congress these days. I have been here exactly 3 years, and I have had to say it has been frustrating each of these 3 years.

In the first 2 years, many of us chafed under rules that prohibited what we perceived to be a majority in Congress from considering legislation that we felt was important for the American people. Now, under the leadership of a new Speaker and a different political party, we continue to cave under the same techniques of managing the business of the House of Representatives.

I would say to my brethren on the other side of the aisle, I certainly shared with you the dismay and frustration when good proposals were held up. Certainly you must understand that the same is happening today, and that altogether too often the rules of the House are being used to keep important initiatives from consideration by the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives. This is certainly happening at this time as I speak.

This leadership is preventing what I would consider to be the majority of the Members of this body from considering a continuing resolution to put Federal employees back to work. Similarly, I expect that the discipline of each political party in this institution is preventing the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives from honestly considering a 7-year deficit reduction plan that actually would work to balance the budget and would have broad support throughout our Nation. It is tragic when the majority so manipulates the rules. I do not care if the majority is Republican or the majority is Democrat, the tragedy is the same.

I think it is important that all of us work together on a bipartisan basis to try to make this institution as effective as possible. Forget about the next election. Forget about who gets credit. Instead, focus on how do we balance the budget, what is right for America, what do the American people expect of us?

I think that if we focus on these considerations, the frustration that I and many others have felt can be overcome. But unless we do that, we, like Oly, are simply going to go back home with a foul odor, that will be immediately noticed by our friends and family and residents of our district. We certainly can handle our responsibilities in a better fashion.

REASONS FOR LACK OF PROGRESS ON BUDGET

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to take this 5-minute special order to discuss the budget and my concerns with the lack of progress and really the lack of response from the administration.

We have heard continuously from some of those Members on the minority side that this really has been caused by a group of so-called radical freshmen Republican Members. Well, I rise as a five-term Republican who over the 10 years I have been in Congress have supported and worked with my colleagues on the other side on labor issues, even opposing NAFTA when my party and this President supported NAFTA; working with Members of the other side on issues like family and medical leave; issues involving reform of Davis-Bacon that is acceptable to the labor unions and the working people of this country; and working on environmental issues and environmental legislation, opposing the riders that were attempted to be inserted in the bill. So I am not someone who rises as someone who has always been against the President. To the contrary, I have been supportive of some of the issues that this administration has supported.

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not what this debate is about. This debate really is about this President finally being called to task to live up to commitments that he has made publicly. He has gotten away with saying one thing and doing something else on numerous occasions that I cannot cite here today. But in this instance, Members on our side, even those of us who have worked with the President on key issues, are saying ''We want to see this President simply come forward and do what he said he would do, and that is to provide for us a detailed seven-year plan to balance the budget.''

Now, why has he not done that? It is because he is reading the political tea leaves and polls. He knows if he comes out with a 7-year plan in detail, he is either going to offend senior citizens or offend those business groups where he told them he would support a capital gains tax cut, or he is going to offend those veterans who he has told he will not have any changes in the way we fund veterans programs, or he is going to offend those defense workers by having to say we need additional cuts in defense, even though he was out in California last week and even made the case, and I cannot believe this, as the Republican who opposed the B–2 bomber, this. He even went so far as to say ''Yes, we may need more than 20 B–2 bombers.'' Talk about ultimate irony, for this President to make that statement.

You see, if this President comes out with a detailed 7-year plan that lays out specifics like we have, he is going to take some heat, and this President does not like to take heat.

Mr. Speaker, the time for this rhetoric and demagoguery has ended. As I said earlier today, the Philadelphia Enquirer, no bastion of conservative politics in this country, said it best today in one of their lead editorials. The headline is, ''Your turn, Bill. Clinton must offer the serious budget he promised.''

I will insert this editorial in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, but let me read the final paragraph of the editorial.

> Congress should pass stopgap funding as soon as the President provides the missing ingredient of serious bargaining: A credible White House plan to balance the budget in seven years.

Even the Philadelphia Enquirer has now read through the demagoguery of this President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we hear opponents on the other side say ''You are offending the American people. They do not buy what you are doing. It is wrong.'' That may be the case. But let me just remind them of one plain and simple fact: Since Bill Clinton took office 3 years ago, there have now been as of today 182 publicly elected officials switch parties in this country; 182, Mr. Speaker. All 182 who switched parties, from Maine to Washington State, to the southern States, were Democrats who switched to the Republican Party. All 182 publicly elected officials, including 7 Members of the U.S. Congress, have now distanced themselves from this President.

□ 1630

So my colleagues on the other side may be right. Maybe the President has it all right and in the end this game of smoke and mirrors and images and perceptions will win. I think not. I think the American people are smarter than that, and these 182 elected officials who have switched parties and joined the Republican Party agree with us that this President must finally do what he said that he wants to do, and that is give us a detailed plan. If he does that, I will join with the Philadelphia Enquirer tomorrow, or tonight, and I will vote for a CR to get the Federal employees back to work, but I want to see the President's detailed plan.

Where is it and when will we see it? Now is the time, Mr. President. Provide us your detailed plan for balancing the Federal budget.

PRIVATE BUSINESSES WOULD NOT SHUT DOWN THE WAY GOVERNMENT HAS SHUT DOWN

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

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last year there was a popular film in our country called ''Dumb and Dumber.'' I often wondered why they did not call it ''Dumb and Dumbest.'' Ah, because that would convey the message a little bit better. But now I understand the reason, unfortunately, is the dumbest idea has been reserved for action taken by this Congress.

I have been in public life 12 years, and I am sad to say that this furlough is the dumbest thing I have seen government do in my 12 years in business. I have come down to this well several times to talk about the furlough, which is, in effect, paying people either to stay home or telling them that they have to work and they are not going to get paid.

I have basically issued a challenge, a little contest, if you will, because I am still looking for one business, one business in this entire country that twice in the same year would get so mad at itself that it would tell its workers go home, stay at home, and I am going to pay you. I have not got a call from a single business in this country that would do that.

I was on a talk radio show last week in my district, and I did have a caller who called in and said, ''Well, I love what Speaker GINGRICH is doing and I support what he is doing.'' I said, ''Well, let me ask you this, then. Would you, if you were using your own money, send your employees home, tell them to stay at home and that you were going to pay them?'' And he hemmed and hawed a little and said, ''No, I would not.'' I said, ''Well, I find it interesting that we now have the leadership in Congress who has come here and said we are going to run Congress like a business when there is not a single business in this country that would run itself the way Congress is running itself right now.'' It does not make any sense at all.

Now, what should we be doing today? We are in special orders now, and the reason we are in special orders is because the Speaker and the majority will not let us even vote on a measure to get these people back to work. The Senate has passed it unanimously. The majority leader in the Senate was quoted as saying, ''Enough is enough.'' And enough is enough. These are people who want to work, who should be working, and who should be getting paid.

Now, I hear Members from the other side come down into the well and talk about sacrifice and that there is a greater mission here and a greater good. Those are not people who talk to the people I talk to in my district, because I fielded as many calls as I could from employees.

I talked to a woman who works for the FBI in Milwaukee who commutes 100 miles a day, who has two foster children, who is living from paycheck to paycheck.

I talked to a woman who works in the U.S. attorney's office, who is being forced to work and is not being paid. There are people in our neighborhood, the husband works for the VA hospital, two small children, his wife is at home. He is required to work and is not being paid.

This morning I talked to a guard at the Oxford Federal Prison in Wisconsin. Three hundred employees are being required to work but are not being paid. I said, ''Well, what type of people do you have at the Oxford Prison?'' He said, ''We have a lot of drug offenders. Most of the people here have violent pasts.'' We are asking Federal guards to guard people who have been convicted of murder and selling drugs, and we are asking them to work without pay.

Mr. Speaker, that is unconscionable. That should not happen in the United States. That should not happen in England. That should not happen in any country in this world.

Again, we hear the speakers on the other side talk about sacrifice. The gentleman from Florida earlier talked about how moved he was that he talked to an older gentleman, a senior citizen on Meals on Wheels, and that gentleman said, the senior citizen purportedly said that he was willing to give up a meal in order to get a balanced budget.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask any citizen in this country to give up a meal so that we can pass a bill that has tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest people in this country. It is wrong and we should not be doing it.

Mr. Speaker, again, the Members on the other side talk about sacrifice, and it is necessary for these employees to sacrifice. Again, I was in my district talking to employees and they asked the obvious question. ''What about you, Mr. Congressman? Why are you not sacrificing?'' And to be honest, my initial response to them was, I have got a wife and I have got two children to support. And they jeered. They said so do we.

I had to go home and think about that. I had to go home and think about it, even though I voted every time to get these people back to work. I had to think about the fact that they are in the same situation as I am. I have a 1- and 3-year-old at home and a wife at home. I do not want to give up my pay.

But, Mr. Speaker, I decided today that I should do what many of my colleagues have done and that is to say that I will put myself in the same position as the other Federal employees. If we are asking them to sacrifice, well, then we should sacrifice, too. And I ask my colleagues to do the same thing, and that will end this misery.

IMPASSE ON FEDERAL BUDGET AND GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN ARE SEPARATE ISSUES

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, we face today two separate controversies, two separate controversies that have been combined and confused, deliberately and improperly combined and confused.

The first controversy is the impasse on the Federal budget. This impasse involves real and serious issues. The Republicans want to balance the budget and they want to make huge cuts in Medicare and in Medicaid in order to pay for a very large tax cut benefiting mostly the wealthiest Americans. Democrats, for the most part, want to balance the budget, but they want to do it while protecting Medicare and Medicaid, college loans, education, and the environment.

These are serious differences and serious issues, and their outcome will determine the fundamental direction the country will take over the next few years, and these controversies deserve real and perhaps lengthy and extended debate. But this controversy should not lead to a shutdown of the Federal Government.

This is the second separate issue, the unnecessary, deliberate, unconscionable shutdown of the Federal Government with all the suffering and pain that that implies and that brings forth for Government employees, for private contractors, for private citizens in all walks of life that have been talked about on this floor today.

Mr. Speaker, we have had over the years many budget disagreements between the Congress and the President. Many times appropriations bills were not completed and signed into law on time. This year, because of the unnecessary delay because we wasted the first 100 days of the year on the Republicans' contract on America, and we did not start working on the appropriations bills until April instead of in January, the situation was worse than usual. But these disagreements, failure to pass the appropriations bills on time, do not normally lead to an extended shutdown of the Federal Government.

We are told by the Republicans that the President is responsible for the shutdown because he vetoed appropriations bills. Presidents Reagan and Bush vetoed appropriations bills. That did not cause extended shutdowns of the Federal Government. The normal method of avoiding a shutdown of the Federal Government is to pass a continuing resolution saying that every department of Government will continue operating on the same rate of funding as it did last year, or perhaps at 90 or 85 percent or whatever is agreed upon indefinitely while the negotiations on next year's budget proceed.

That is normally done. But the Republicans will not pass a continuing resolution, the normal method of keeping the Government in operation while the controversy over the new budget is determined. They will not pass it.

The only reason for the Government shutdown is that the Republicans, led by Speaker NEWT GINGRICH, decided months ago that they would use the threat or the reality of a Government shutdown to attempt to blackmail the President into going along with budgetary solutions that he does not approve. This is wrong.

Our Democratic system provides the proper means to work out policy and budget disagreements. The majority in Congress in both Houses passes a budget. The President signs it or he vetoes it, the various appropriations bills. Then there is an attempt to override. If they cannot override, they have further negotiations and eventually a compromise. If they cannot override the veto, if they cannot negotiate and come to a compromise, eventually they take it to the people. They say the President is unreasonable in his vetoes, let us get a new President; or the majority in Congress is unreasonable in its bills and let us get a new majority, and the American people make the ultimate decision. But while this is going on, the Government continues to operate on a continuing resolution.

This year, the Republicans say, no, we cannot pass a continuing resolution because we do not trust the President. He does not keep his word. Obviously, I do not believe this to be true, but even if it were true, it is not material to this. The Republicans say they must keep the Federal Government shut down until the President keeps his word and produces a 7-year balanced budget according to CBO figures. And if he will not do that, they will not open the Government. They will make us all suffer. They will make the American people suffer.

But the Federal Government is not a plaything or a possession of the President. The Federal Government does not belong to him. It belongs to the American people. Opening the Government is not a reward to the President for good conduct and closing it is not a punishment of the President for unacceptable conduct. Closing the Government, holding the people who need Government services, whether that be welfare checks or SSI or Medicare or passports, holding it closed is holding the American people hostage. It is not a legitimate negotiating tactic no matter what one thinks of the President's negotiating tactics. It is an abuse of power.

Let us keep the two issues separate. Let us vote on a continuing resolution to reopen the Federal Government, and then let us work out the differences on a permanent budget.

REPUBLICANS BELIEVE THEIR BUDGET TO BE PERFECT; WITHOUT ROOM FOR NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, this has been a very interesting time for me, in the time I have been here, for all these years. First of all, if we buy the rhetoric from our friends in the Republican party, we have to assume that there should not be any negotiations on the budget; that the President should just sign the budget that they sent to him; that it is a perfect document, he cannot improve on it, it has all the cures for the ills that affect this country.

The President has real concerns, and so do the majority of the American people have concerns about the budget that the Republicans sent to the President of the United States, especially our senior citizens, our health delivery system, our hospitals, and I have just a whole list here from hospitals in North Carolina, veterans hospitals and private hospitals that say that this budget would be devastating to the delivery system to our senior citizens and to Medicare, not only in North Carolina but all across the country.

So we have to assume that the Republicans are saying that all we have to do, all the President has to do to put these people back to work is to sign their budget; that there is no room for negotiations. There is no room for negotiations on the taxes, there is no room for negotiations on the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid.

Throughout history, Mr.. Speaker, presidents have had the option to veto legislation, and then we try to work out the differences, but we do not shut down the Government and inconvenience millions of people.

There is one facility that is very, very special to me. There is a VA Hospital in my district, in Salisbury, NC, and when I went there over 40 years ago, one of the first places we went—I was in an entertainment group, and we went to this hospital and we entertained the veterans.

□ 1745

And to this day, I go on a regular basis to entertain the veterans and to meet with them and to listen to their problems.

I want to tell my colleagues that our veterans' hospitals are in dire circumstances today, and I talked with a number of them today. Not only is their help getting frustrated; they are not being paid, and in one instance, a man who is used to getting $500 to $600 a week, he received $141, and this is a man with a family. But it is beginning to trickle down to the care of these veterans in these hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, that is our brothers, our uncles, our parents. These are veterans that served in Korea and Vietnam and some as old as World War II, and through no fault of their own, they are being penalized by losing the services that our Federal employees provide to these veterans.

Mr., Speaker, it is just plain wrong for us to hold these Government employees hostage to debates that are going on at the White House down on Pennsylvania Avenue. There is absolutely no reason why we cannot put these people back to work. And, of course, one of the Presidential candidates says: No big deal. Who misses these Federal employees?

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you who misses them. Those senior citizens that want to file for their Social Security, they have become 62 or 65 and they want to file for their Social Security. They cannot do it. We have the people that work in the hospitals that are looking after these veterans, and some of them completely incapacitated, and those nurses' aides and nurses that are carrying around the bedpans, they either are not being paid or are being half paid.

But guess what? The people that are perpetrating this hoax on the American people, every one of them is getting a full paycheck the first of the month. We could even be voting here today on a measure that says we are going to give up some of our pay, but they will not even allow that.

So, it is not just Federal employees that are being inconvenienced; it is average hard-working American citizens that believe in Government, that have

paid their taxes, and they expect the services that the Government renders to them as citizens. This is not fair. There is no reason. I challenge anybody on the other side of the aisle to come and give me a valid reason why we cannot put the Federal employees back to work and continue the negotiations down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Now, what I say today, is it worth inconveniencing millions of Americans to get at the President of the United States? Is it worth that to my colleagues? This is just plain wrong. It is not the American way. Let us put these people back to work and make America work like it is supposed to work, and work out our differences like we always have over the past years in honest negotiations on legitimate differences in philosophy.

IN SUPPORT OF EMERGENCY STATUS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as this debate has proceeded, I have been listening to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle talk about who is responsible for the shutdown, and I will go into that in a moment. But in the course of the debate it was interesting to hear people refer to various symbols of patriotism in our country: the American flag, the eagle, Uncle Sam. Uncle Sam, he is a symbol of the Federal Government, but he has now become our deadbeat uncle, because across the country as we all sat down to our Christmas dinners and the start of a new year, many Federal workers were deprived of their pay, even those who were working.

Even further than that, many people who depend on the Federal Government to function not only now experience a tightening of the belt, but a closing down of their businesses, whether it is a sandwich shop near a Federal building or a tourist bed-and-breakfast near Yosemite National Park or some other national park throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, as we convene this second session of this Congress, we should all be ashamed of the disrespect with which Congress is treating hundreds of thousands of our valued Federal employees, public servants who want to work, many who are working now, and who perform important services for the people of our Nation.

Federal workers have been caught in the middle, against their will, held hostage to the machinations of the 104th Congress. This is a personal loss for many, and it is also a loss to the American taxpayer who has invested in Federal performance. It is time to end the Federal Government shutdown and to allow 260,000 Federal workers to return to their jobs. It is self-evident, I think, Mr. Speaker, that people who work should get paid for their work. Why should that be a mystery? Why is that even an issue here?

But do not take my word for it. I think it would be important to hear the voices of some Federal employees who yesterday rallied across the country. Their cry was: We will no longer be sacrificial lambs. Some of their individual stories are so definitive, so clear about why we should end this shutdown, that I want to share some of their words with you.

Pete, who files papers in the U.S. attorney's office, told the crowd of coworkers that she brought her two children to work yesterday because she could not afford child care after her paycheck stopped. Her children are at work with her as she changes diapers while she does work for the Federal Government.

Howard exclaimed, ''If you do work, you should get paid. This is a type of 20th century slavery. We're responsible for our rent and board. Nobody else is going to be paying for it. We cannot file for unemployment,'' this particular group could not. ''We cannot file for food stamps. What can we do?''

And finally, Eula said that she can now barely afford the gas money to get her from home to work. She has a commute between Antioch and Richmond, CA. Lajuana Brown had to cancel her 2-week Christmas vacation to work, and then had to ask her mother to take care of her children because she could not afford day care.

Mr. Speaker, the stories go on and on and on. In the course of the debate, our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle have made various comments as to where the blame lay for this shutdown. It is interesting to hear them talk, because some of the comments seem to be contradictory, if the Parliamentarian would allow such a word.

First of all, they talk about if the President had not vetoed these bills. Thank God the President vetoed these totally unacceptable bills. They contend that they support a line-item veto, except not for this President. How inconsistent of them to argue about a President vetoing a bill, supporting a line-item veto, and not giving it to President Clinton.

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

Ms. PELOSI. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HEFNER. Does my memory fail me? Did we not pass the line-item veto in the last session of Congress?

Ms. PELOSI. We did, in fact. It was one of the provisions of the contract, but not to apply to President Clinton.

Mr. HEFNER. That was not specified, that it would not apply to the President. They just have not given it to him yet.

Ms. PELOSI. They just have not given it to President Clinton, because of the delay.

They also talk about compassion. How many times have we heard our colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle say neither party has a monopoly on compassion? Well, I say to them, my Republican colleagues, that compassion without a positive initiative for change and for action is an empty emotion.

Sure, we are all compassionate, but what does that mean unless it translates into action to meet the needs of America's families, and certainly not to send them to work without paying them?

They talk about the capital gains tax and say, ''Oh, President Clinton says he will support a capital gains tax.'' President Clinton said he would be open to some capital gains tax, not the giveaway to the rich for any turnover of any asset that our Republican colleagues are advocating.

Last of all, because I do not have any more time, I want to say the other contradiction that I hear is that they say that Congress should obey the rules that other people do. If that is the case, then Congress should not be receiving a paycheck at a time when other Federal workers are not. I call upon the Republican leadership to bring legislation to the floor to effect that. It has been proposed by our Democratic colleagues. So much to say, so little time.

PAINTED INTO A CORNER BY GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, here we are, American people, at the 4th day of January, 1996, almost 5 o'clock in the afternoon, and what are we doing? We are talking.

Mr. Speaker, in November a year ago the American people put the Republicans in charge of the U.S. Congress. They have a majority in the House and the Senate. They set the agenda. We cannot bring anything up unless they bring it up. They are meeting at 7 o'clock tonight to try figure out how to get themselves out of the predicament, how to get themselves out of corner that they painted themselves into in this ridiculous exercise.

One of the reasons I think the American people put the Republicans in charge is they thought that they could run this place like a business. Well, that turned out to be a joke. What business have we ever heard of that got mad, could not make a decision, sent its employees home and said, ''Stay home, but I will pay you anyway, except the essential ones, you keep working but I am not going to pay you for the work that you have done''? I have never heard of an American business that is run that way; certainly not in my congressional district.

Mr. Speaker, then there is all this argument about the balanced budget. Well, I do not know anybody that is not for a balanced budget in this whole House of Representatives or in this whole Congress. The question is who is going to pay the cost of the balanced budget? Who is going to bear the burden of the balanced budget?

Well, the Republicans have picked out their victims. Their victims are the sick, old and young sick, the aged, the working poor, and a portion of the middle class to bear the burden. And at the same time they have granted to their rich contributors substantial tax breaks, people who do not need the tax breaks, who really have not asked for the tax breaks. I know a lot of them; they have never asked me for one. And this is the silliest way I have ever seen to run a government.

Now that covers a lot. I have been around here for 33 years and in legislative bodies for a total of 43 years, so I have seen some silly things done. But the mismanagement of NEWT GINGRICH and company, the mismanagement of our Republican colleagues of the time and of the energy and of the money of this country and of the resources of this country is a shame.

Here in January 1996, we should be making substantial plans as to how the budget will be balanced, making equitable changes. Now, this balanced budget is not a lot different than other attempts that we have made. The amount of dollars are about the same as amount of dollars that we did 4 years ago and 2 years ago, the undertakings that we are taking. But most of the balance in this so-called balanced budget operation does not come at the beginning; it comes in the year 2001 and the year 2002.

Now, we all know what is going to happen then. By that time there will be a whole new group of people in charge in this country, and most of the silly things that are being said here today will have been forgotten and most of the savings that we are talking about will have been forgotten.

I talk a lot to the elderly. I guess they picked me out for conversation because they think I am about their age and I have got some comity with them. They are worried to death about being forced into managed care where they will get a gatekeeper for their medical care instead of a physician when they call on the phone for a doctor's appointment. They are scared that managed care will mean that the insurance companies will decide whether they get a treatment or not, not their doctor.

Most of us go to a doctor because we think we need to go to a doctor. But I would rather go to a doctor that is going to be rewarded by being paid for what he does for me, not being rewarded by what he does not do for me. These are the kind of things that worry Americans.

□ 1700

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

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

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, as we meet here on the eve of a new year, as we begin 1996 with the budget still unresolved, I think it is important to speak of the situation in historical context. In the 15½ years that I have been in Congress, I only experienced about 9 months of Government that was not divided where the House and the Senate and the White House were controlled by the same party. For most of that time, we have enjoyed or suffered through divided Government in America. The White House was controlled by one party, and the Congress was generally controlled by the other party. We are in that same situation today, only a little differently.

In most of those 15 years, the Republican Party controlled the White House and the Democratic Party controlled the Congress. In the course of that 15-year period, we have had Government shutdowns. This is, I think, the fifth one we have experienced in the course of those 15 years. Most of them have been rather brief. They have been total shutdowns over a weekend or a few days, and eventually things were worked out. Unfortunately, the way things were worked out was typically business as usual. There were compromises made; there was gives and takes. There were deals cut. There was a sentiment that, well, it is better to take a bad deal and go home than to duke it out and see if we cannot resolve our budget problems and somehow eventually balance the U.S. budget.

The product of business as usual over those 15 years of budget battles that led to temporary shutdowns and eventually continuing resolutions was a deepening and a worsening U.S. public debt. It has reached a point today, now, where every young person today is likely to spend as much as 80 to 90 percent of their income in taxes to some government, State, local or Federal, during their lifetime. That is what economists tell us the debt is doing to us.

It has reached a point today where a young child born today will spend $187,000 just paying interest on the debt we have accumulated. It has reached the point today where if we do not begin solving the Medicare crisis in this country, we will have two choices 7 years from now. We will face a Medicare system completely bankrupt and we will either have no Medicare system for our elderly, or we will have to double payroll taxes on working Americans. That will be the choice 7 years from now if we do not stick around and resolve this budget debate in this, the early days of January, or, if necessary, through 1996 until we reach election day and let the voters decide who is right or wrong.

At some point Americans are going to have to make a decision. Do they really like business as usual, where deals are cut at the end of every fiscal year and we go deeper and deeper into debt or would they rather some President at some time design a balanced budget amendment based on honest numbers within a reasonable period of time that will end this fiscal insanity both for ourselves and for our children?

If you are conservative, you certainly want that done. If you are liberal and you see every year more and more of the Federal budget spent on interest on the debt instead of on programs for Americans, you ought to also want that done. We ought to agree upon that.

And so during the course of the last few months and the year, we offered an amendment to the Constitution requiring that Congress do that. We were met with objections here in the House. We succeeded in passing it in the House. We were met with objections in the other body. They did not pass it in the other body.

The objections generally ran like this. We do not need the Constitution to tell Congress to balance the budget. We can do it ourselves and we ought to do it now. That was the objection of the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. We do not need a constitutional amendment. We can do it and we ought to do it now.

Well, why not now? Why not a budget agreement that balances the budget in 7 years on honest numbers right now?

That is what this historic fight is all about. That is why we are in this awful period of partial Government shutdown, why we have this awful debate on our hands were sometimes it gets acrimonious and personal, and it should never get to that point, but that is why we stand here in the course of these early days in January struggling with the notion of how do we negotiate eventually to a position of a balanced budget in 7 years using honest numbers without doing business as usual, without caving in to all those who want to keep on taxing and spending as we have done for generations to the point that our children now are deeply in debt and will remain in debt for the duration of their lives. How do we resolve it. We resolve it by agreeing now to a balanced budget plan.

THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it may well be that in the 20th day of this crisis we are too close to it, have been too immersed in it to think clearly our way out of it. It is actually 25 days, if you consider the 5 days of the previous shutdown.

Let us look at what we say we are doing. The other side honestly admits that its purpose is to bring leverage on the President. Examining that proposition, it is clear that the other side has succeeded in bringing leverage as much as they are ever going to do.

Let me explain why. The fact is that the President has now signed on to a 7-year balanced budget. He had not done that before. Having done that, it would

seem to me that the majority would acknowledge that they have accomplished what they said was their greatest goal. Moreover, the leverage has gone as far as it can go, if I may say so, because, to use the words of the gentleman from Texas, Mr. DELAY, from your side, he was talking about Mr. DOLE: The President can't cave, because to simply give in is to reinforce a part of his reputation that he is trying to live down. It is time for the majority to declare victory and let the Federal workers come back to work, because the leverage rationale has been spent. It is over. Declare victory.

Indeed, it is worse than that. The leverage has yielded a boomerang crisis, if you will, my friends, an in-your-face crisis. In the beginning the most visible victims were Federal workers, and people shrugged. They had not felt it themselves. Now we are beginning to get great sympathy for Federal workers and no wonder. When a GS–2, to cite a specific example, opens up her paycheck, as she did this week, and finds in it $4, then of course you are going to get sympathy from all across the country. She is a hapless victim. By the way, the IRS and the Social Security did take their share. They left her $4.

About half of those who do contractual work for the Federal Government are out of work. The trade-off that has now become the mantra of the other side simply does not work and is itself an outrage. Well, we may have to leave these workers at home in order to save our children. Let us not talk about trading off one group of innocent victims for another. But the boomerang crisis that we better see, my colleagues on the other side, very quickly, is a service crisis, not a worker crisis. Let me document that.

On January 2, the States lost $74 million in quarterly grants that they use to confront the crisis with abused children, and there are 2.5 million of those children. By the end of the week, 11 States and 2 of the territories, the Virgin Islands and the District of Columbia, which of course is the District and not a territory, will run out of funds for Federal unemployment insurance. Do my colleagues think they are going to get off scot-free as their constituents confront that?

Twenty-three thousand Americans per day are unable to get passports. Many of them are going abroad for business. Twenty-four thousand contract Medicare claim workers are not being paid. They will not be on the job very long. Your State is going to run out of Medicaid funds in January. Are you prepared to take the responsibility for that? One thousand workplace safety complaints per day are going unanswered. The FBI has ceased to train local law enforcement officers.

Employment discrimination complaints are no longer being investigated. Twenty thousand foreign visitors per day are unable to get visas for a loss here of $60 million per day. Do my colleagues really mean to inflict this kind of pain on their constituents and mine? I think not.

My colleagues have replaced the main course, the balanced budget, with a side dish, and that is the crisis my colleagues have left us with. Let us get back to the balanced budget. Let the workers come back to work.

TYRANNY OF THE URGENT

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I did not come to the Congress until I was 66 years old. There is some advantage in coming here at that age. If you come here younger, if you have spent much of your life here, I think that you miss some opportunities, some insights into relevance, time and perspective and things like the tyranny of the urgent.

Let me give my colleagues two examples from my past. I had the great privilege of working for 18 years in several different capacities for the military. In one of those capacities, I was working, for part of my time at least, out of the Navy Yard in Philadelphia. There we had the responsibility for two things: One was for supporting the fleet. When they had problems with their life support equipment, with oxygen equipment and so forth, we had to go out to make sure that those problems were fixed. We also had the opportunity, the responsibility there for developing new equipment that would be better, that would have less problems, and we would have to spend less of our time going out to support the fleet.

This was an excellent example of the tyranny of the urgent. When we had a call from the fleet that was an urgent problem and we had to go out to address it, the really important thing that that facility was charged with doing was developing new equipment so we would not have those problems in the future. But the tyranny of the urgent frequently got in the way of developing the new equipment.

In 1954, in another experience, I was coming back from California from teaching medical school there to teach medical school here in Howard University. I was in the middle of Missouri with my family with young children and a 1941 Cadillac and a big trailer on the back that had in it all of my worldly possessions. A tire blew out on the Cadillac and the trailer turned over. I stood on the road there in the summertime in the hot sun in Missouri, and I thought, gee, if you put yourself 10 years in the future from this and look back, this is not going to be a big deal. It was not. I did step back, and really, as I look back on it now, it was not a big deal.

Let me apply these two things to our partial shutdown of Government now. We must be very careful that we do not permit the urgent to take precedence over the important. The really important thing now is that we balance this budget. We have an urgent problem with a partial shutdown of Government. There has been enough talk from both sides as to how we got there from my perspective and I think the perspective of most Americans, the President has failed to keep his promise to submit a balanced budget.

You cannot negotiate, you cannot negotiate when there is only one budget to negotiate. He needs to submit a balanced budget. The urgent thing is somehow to get around this problem, but the way to get around that is not to have another continuing resolution that is going to take the pressure off to do the important thing. And the important thing is to balance this budget.

I was talking about the time and perspective. If we put ourselves down the road 10 years from now and look back, nobody hardly is going to remember this partial shutdown of government. But they are going to remember and they are going to thank us for holding tough and balancing the budget. We must be very sure that we have a perspective of the relevance of what we are doing. We must make very sure that we do not permit the tyranny of the urgent over the important.

Our constituents understand that. I had a letter during our first brief partial shutdown. It was the kind of letter that just about brought tears to your eye. It was a Federal worker who said he did not know he was going to get paid when he was furloughed.

□ 1715

He said he was probably going to lose $500. But that was a small enough price to pay for what this balanced budget would do for his children and his grandchildren.

Here I have some constituent opinions from phone calls from five of our constituents. We have had many, many like this. This one is from Hagerstown, MD, the Federal employee who was furloughed, but he thinks that I should stick with the Republican plan to balance the budget.

Here is another one. These are parents of, and these are from Flintstone, way out in western Maryland. They are parents of five children and grandparents of 11, and he is disabled, but they want the Congressman, their Congressman, to vote only on a balanced budget. They are proud of what we are doing for them here. They want me to hang tough.

Here is one from New Market, MD. Keep the Government closed. This is a Federal worker with 22 years of experience in the Federal Government. He says, ''Don't buckle, stand fast.''

Here is another one from Ellicott City, just south of Baltimore, just north of here, a furloughed Federal District employee. He wants the RGB to stay the course.

Another who congratulates on our budget stand: Do not support a continuing resolution.

Our people understand better than we do the real important thing here and the relevance of what we are doing. They want us to stand firm, stay the course, balance the budget.

IN 1 YEAR REPUBLICAN MAJORITY BRINGS CRISIS TO GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I think that the people who are not able to pay their rent this month or maybe the ones who are not going to make their mortgage payments are going to remember this time. As my colleagues know, a lot of speakers have talked from this side about this balanced budget. Well, I think we have to separate the balanced budget from keeping the Government open. I want to talk a little bit though about this balanced budget.

When Ronald Reagan became President of this country, the deficit was $74 billion. When President Bush left office, the deficit was $300 billion. When Bill Clinton became President, it was $300 billion, and today, thanks to the President's budget of 1993, the deficit is half, is $161 billion, half what it was then. But it is very interesting because there was not one Republican vote for that budget, that budget which has reduced the deficit by half.

OK, now they say to us, especially the new Republicans—well, they have not been here very long so I understand they are not sure of all the things that are going on, but let me tell you. They say we are going to keep this Government closed unless we have a balanced budget. Well, their memories are very short because there was a balanced budget offered on this floor, a 7-year balanced budget, a 7-year balanced budget with CBO scoring. They did not vote for it. Why? Because it did not have that $245 billion tax break for the wealthy.

So yesterday we asked if that budget could come back up, could we vote for a balanced budget, 7 years, no tax break for the wealthy. Well, the Republican leadership would not let us vote on it.

So it is not the balanced budget they care about. They want to keep this Government closed down because, like the former speaker, they do not seem to understand that individual Americans are hurting, people have to pay their rent, people have to make a mortgage payment.

Senator DOLE, who is the head of the other body, got together with the Democrats and the Republicans on the 21st, and that was just Tuesday. They passed a continuing resolution, get the Government back. We begged yesterday, please bring that continuing resolution up that the Senate has passed, let us get the Government back to work. But, no, we were not allowed to vote on that, just as we were not allowed to vote on the real balanced budget.

Now I have heard people here say this is an inconvenience, the Government shutdown. They will not remember the Government shutdown. Well, let me tell you just what is happening to seniors in Oregon, and it is happening to seniors across the country.

Meals on Wheels. We have two Meals on Wheels places in Portland. They serve seniors every day. Well, they are going to be out of business by the end of next week. Too bad, seniors, no meals for you because the Republicans say they want to balance the budget but they will not vote on a balanced budget.

There is very important research going on right now on a disease that affects seniors: Alzheimer's. Alzheimer's research has been stopped in the National Institute of Health because they say we do not care if the Government is shut down.

Medicare contractors who pay the health care claims of our elderly; they are being asked to use their own funds to operate because the Government is shut down. What a disgrace.

Federal investigators who investigate fraud that affects all of us, but particularly seniors, they are not being paid, they are not being paid.

Now what I want to say to my colleagues is that for 40 years you have tried to be in the majority. All right; now you are in the majority. But you know what? You were not able to do the simple work that was required to get the appropriation bills to the President so the Government would keep working. In 1 year this Government had been brought to a crisis. It is time to stop that, it is time to go with the Senate version, have a continuing resolution, and later today someone will come forward and suggest we all go home for a vacation. Well, I am not going to go home for vacation until the Government is back on its feet, and none of us should.

It is a shame, it is a shame.

THE PRESIDENT DID NOT KEEP HIS WORD

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

Mr. BONO. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I happen to have been sued very often in my life. I dislike all of that because it just seems to take everything out of your hands, and pretty soon a judge is telling you how you have to live, and why, and what, and where. And the greatest lesson I—one of the greatest lessons I ever got was when I was sued for indentured servitude, white slavery, and it got all throughout the press, and all the press read it, and it described me as a Svengali and that I controlled this person's life. Then it got to court, and it was thrown out because it was ridiculous. But that stayed with me for many, many years, until eventually people found out the truth.

So my point is that you sit here and try to find out what all of this means and what all this dialog is about, and people tell you different stories about different situations, and they say, well, if the Republicans would just sign a CR, they would not inflict pain. Well, you know that depends on if the glass is half empty or half full.

If the President had kept his word—now understand this, which I think is far more important: Our President should keep his word. He said, ''I agree to a balanced budget, scored by CBO, within 7 years, by a certain date.'' When that date came and went, he did not perform, and we gave him a CR, taking his word, and he violated his word. So now they are saying, well, give us another CR.

So, you know, if you get burned once, then you are a little reluctant to keep playing the same game over and over. So when you say there is pain inflicted, look at the President and ask him why he said he would do something, and we all agreed, and everybody was happy, and then refused to do it.

So you know this notion that there is just one party to blame, and that is why I go to this other story about myself, is that I did not do anything wrong, but the perception was that; and we have not done anything wrong, but they are trying to give you that perception that we do not care.

I am very sensitive to seniors, I am very sensitive to people who do not get a paycheck. I spent many months not getting a paycheck.

But that is not the point. The point is I came here, and I said to my constituents and you Americans, ''You know, we must balance the budget. You don't have an imbalanced budget at home, and we have got to balance it for you.'' I promised to do that. So all year I have been working to balance the budget.

Now we are here, we are at this critical confrontation, Mr. Speaker, and this is why we have fought so hard over this issue, and here we are with a confrontation.

Now, does it make any sense to say, OK, here we are with this issue, now let us back all the way off and do everything back on the President's terms? Not to me it does not. Because he does not keep his word I have a very hard time trusting what he will say in the future, and so I think now we have to, of course, stand tough, but certainly we are not insensitive to this, and if there is an insensitivity, look at the person that did not keep his word.

I just want to say to you, things are not always as they appear, and rhetoric is rhetoric. Always try to find out the facts, and the facts are the President did not keep his word.

IT IS WRONG TO USE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AS PAWNS IN THE GAME OF THE BUDGET DEBATE

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

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the reason that I wanted to have that minute was to give the gentleman an opportunity to discuss, just for at least a moment, his proposition that the President has not kept his word. I appreciate the civility of his comments and understand he has been an ex-mayor, he has had some legislative experience; but it is hard for me to comprehend why would he punish innocent people if somebody else does not keep their word? We are legislators. Why do we not get together then, and come up with a proposition, and we could present it to the President? I fail to understand the rationale, and I do not think the American people accept the proposition that because the President is perceived by the gentleman from California and his colleagues as not having kept his word, they are going to punish the American people.

Punishing the American people will not solve it. We are legislators. We need to solve it right here in this Chamber.

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, the time has come in this Chamber for action. Senator DOLE summed it up absolutely correct when he said in the other Chamber, ''Enough is enough,'' as he guided a continuing resolution through the other Chamber that opened up the Federal Government.

We need to do the same thing in this Chamber.

I have thousands of Federal employees in my district, in the Social Security Administration, in the Veterans' Administration, at Federal prisons, at Minersville, Lewisburg, and Allenwood who are either on a furlough, or who are being forced to work extra hours, an extra shift, and not being paid. It is not right to use Federal employees as pawns in this game in this whole budget debate.

□ 1730

So I say to my colleagues, let us pass a continuing resolution and let us continue this debate on balancing the budget.

I say to my colleagues on the other side, I want to work with you. I want to work with you in balancing the budget in 7 years using CBO numbers, and we can do that. The framework for doing that is already in place. We need to continue the dialog and have a give-and-take process.

If you look at the coalition budget that was offered in this House, it balanced the budget in 7 years and had no tax cuts. I say to you that is a framework. We can work with that and we can balance the budget. You look at the budget that passed this House and we had $245 billion in tax breaks in that. To me, that is personally unacceptable; it is too large. But I am willing to go halfway and meet my friend on the other side in moving toward balancing the budget.

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

Mr. HOLDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's attitude, and I would be open to work with you guys on that. I think a lot of people on our side of the aisle would. I also want to say that I am one of those who think that we should get the folks back working.

Let me say this: Would the President accept that coalition budget? Because one of our reluctances is that if we pass that, will the President stand behind it?

Mr. HOLDEN. I do not know if the President will accept that budget, but I can tell you that I will accept it, and there are numerous Members on our side of the aisle who have already voted for it and many more who will vote for it when it comes up again.

When you look at the differences in the budget, the budget that passed the House that the gentleman voted for had a $245 billion tax break in it. If you would reduce that, say, down to $110 or $100 billion, still giving a tax break to working families, and put that $100 or $110 billion in savings into the Medicare system where we would only be having, say, $150 or $170 billion in the slowing of growth of the Medicare Program, that is something that is acceptable to me.

I look at my district where I have 95,000 Medicare recipients and thousands more waiting to go into the Medicare Program; and I look at the hospitals in my district, and right now they are only receiving $1 for every $1 of services they are providing for Medicare patients. Under the proposed budget that the gentleman voted for, that would go down to 88 cents.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I want you to know that I believe that there is a lot of room for discussion on that. I do not pretend to represent all Republicans on this, but I know that there are many who would like to work with you on it. Again, the concern is, could we do it as a veto-proof measure if the President will not go along with a bipartisan budget. Would you have any feel for that?

Mr. HOLDEN. Well, I would say to the gentleman, if we can put a budget on this floor that I believe in, I would vote for it and I would vote to override a veto if it was.

I cannot speak for the entire Democratic membership, but I believe that this process that is going on now where people are saying, it is going to be my way or no way at all, is not healthy for the gentleman or me or the American people. We need to get this process going, and there are points of contention that I believe can be ironed out.

Medicaid is one of the contentions that I have, the Medicaid system. I am not exactly thrilled with block-granting Medicaid, and the reason for that is Pennsylvania has the second highest senior citizen population in the country, next to Florida. Under the proposed budget that passed the House, Pennsylvania would lose $9 billion over 7 years in the Medicaid Program.

Forty-five percent of all Medicaid expenditures in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania are for the senior citizens and nursing homes. So to lose $9 billion, half of that which goes to seniors and nursing homes would put a terrible burden on the Commonwealth.

I am not saying that would vote for a program that block-granted Medicaid, but we would have to make sure it was fair and that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, in my case, would be treated fairly. I am sure the gentleman would feel the same about Georgia.

If I could just sum up and thank the gentleman for the dialog and say that I believe that we can pass a balanced budget, but there are those who will not give in on the tax cut that might have to be left behind, and there are those who do not really have the priority of balancing the budget that may need to be left behind, but we can drive a budget down the middle, and that is what the American people want us to do.

KEEP WORKING TO END THE SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WOOLSEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, today the West Marin Chamber of Commerce in Marin County, CA released a report showing that the communities around and near the Point Reyes National Seashore, which is in my district, have lost upward of $5 million in lost tourist revenues, to date, as a result of the Gingrich government shutdown. That is right. Due to the Gingrich shutdown, business in West Marin is down 45 percent from last year. As one of my constituents said just recently, last year was not a particularly good year.

But it is not just the businesses in West Marin who are hurting, Mr. Speaker. Americans all over the country are being denied crucial services, services that include passports, home mortgages, child support, and small business loans. That is because of the new majority's shutdown. But that is not all either, Mr. Speaker.

If the shutdown continues, if it continues much longer, 600,000 elderly Americans, many of them invalids, may not be able to participate in the popular and successful Meals on Wheels Program.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear: We are already paying the price for the new majority's radical agenda. If you think

this shutdown is bad now, believe me, we are really going to be paying the price if the Republicans get their way when their crown jewel, the special interest tax breaks, and their huge education and Medicare cuts are proposed or go through.

To add insult to injury, the Gingrich Republicans are now talking about calling it quits and going home while people in my district and across this Nation continue to suffer the consequences of the shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, 198 House Democrats want to keep working, working to end the shutdown. The other body wants to keep working; for Pete's sake, BOB DOLE wants to keep working, and as he said just yesterday or earlier this week, enough is enough. But it is the Gingrich Republicans who would rather go home than get Government up and running again. It is the Gingrich Republicans who are willing to hang on to their radical agenda no matter what the impact is on American people, and it is the Gingrich Republicans who are willing to use Federal workers and Federal services, services, by the way, that have been paid for by taxpayers, to try to blackmail the budget process.

Mr. Speaker, for the people of this country, for the families and businesses in my district and across the country, for the honor of this institution, I say to the other party across the aisle here, do not even think about sending us home. We belong here; we must continue working, and we must stop this shutdown and we must do it now.

COMMUNITIES PULLING TOGETHER

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

Mr. ENSIGN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to four banks in southern Nevada. Sunstate Bank, Pioneer Citizens Bank, American Bank of Commerce and Bank West. These four banks, Mr. Speaker, have decided to give interest-free loans to Federal workers who are either furloughed or working and not receiving their full paychecks. This is a private-sector solution happening for community banks helping local people. This is a solution that shows that not all answers have to come from the Federal level.

Mr. Speaker, the presidents of these banks, when I approached them about making these loans, these interest-free loans to Federal employees, jumped at the chance. That is the way local communities pull together. These are people living in the local community; they understand the needs of the local people, and they were willing to pull together to help these Federal employees through this difficulty that each one of them is going through at this point.

A few things that have been addressed tonight, Mr. Speaker, that I would also like to address because in this context of Federal employees being furloughed, we are talking about balancing the Federal budget: There are many, many good people on the other side of the aisle who have talked about balancing the budget and actually have brought a balanced budget to the table. It is something President Clinton himself promised to bring to the table in November, which he has failed to do up to this point. I commend the Democrats in the Congress who have been willing to follow their words with actions and actually bring a balanced budget to the table.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that actions speak louder than words, and in our negotiating, we need to have people to keep their word. But let us keep the bigger picture in mind, Mr. Speaker. Let us keep the big picture of what this country is about.

For the last 26 years, Republicans and Democrats have voted for deficits now that have totaled a national debt of over $5 trillion. It is immoral to live and to pass on debt to your children and your grandchildren while you enjoy the benefits of that spending.

I just had a little girl born on December 2. Every child born in the United States last year has a $187,000 bill hanging over their heads just to pay interest on the national debt in their lifetime. They get nothing for that, just interest, because career politicians here in Washington have been unwilling to say no to special interest groups.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the freshman class came here to do something different. We were elected to say no to the big spending career politicians in Washington, and we are doing that, Mr. Speaker. Today we are faced with the opportunity, the greatest opportunity any of us could have imagined, to actually balance the Federal budget over the next 7 years. Frankly, many of us think that it is too long, 7 years is too long. Some people think that 10 years is maybe the amount of time that we should spend. Seven years I think to most Americans, they think that it is too long as well.

For the last 7 years, we spent a little over $9 trillion, total Federal spending. In the next 7 years under these Republican cuts that you hear about, we are going to spend over $12 trillion, almost $3 trillion more in Federal spending under the Republican plan, and we hear in Washington that is a cut. That is why many of us think that 7 years is actually too long.

Medicare alone, the last 7 years, we spent a little over $900 billion. The next 7 years under Medicare, Mr. Speaker, we are going to spend under the Republican plan of cuts that you hear about, over $1.6 trillion. That is over $700 billion more in the next 7 years versus the last 7 years.

Mr. Speaker, this year in the United States we spend in Medicare $4,800 per person in Medicare this year. Under the Republican plan in the year 2002, we will spend a little over $7,100 under the Republican cuts that you hear about, $4,800 to $7,100.

Under the President's plan, we would be looking at $7,200. A difference of actually $137 a month out of over $7,000 per person spending. It is a minute amount, and yet we hear how the Republicans are going to be throwing old people out in the streets, they will not be able to get quality medical care. I think that if you ask any American if they actually thought about a cut in Medicare, they would think that if you are spending $4,800 a year now, that you would actually be spending less of that in the year 2002 per person.

Mr. Speaker, let us just let the facts speak for themselves. Let us do what is right for the future of America, for my children, for your children and the future of America's children.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP SHOULD KEEP ITS WORD

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

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I have heard a lot about keeping their word. I think one of the most interesting things that has happened this year is that during the first 100 days as a part of the so-called Contract With America, there was an item that some of us supported called the line-item veto.

We passed the line-item veto. It passed both Houses of the Congress and yet it has not been sent to the President for his signature. They will not send it. They will not keep their word, because had there been a line-item veto, we would not be in this shutdown that we are now in. We would be able to continue the operation of Government and the American people would no longer be suffering, and only those items in the budget where there was a bone of contention would be on the table for discussion.

Keeping their word, the Republican leadership ought to keep its word and send to the President a line-item veto and get us out of this shutdown.

There are some of us that have supported a 7-year balanced budget, some in the 103d Congress using CBO numbers, but having no tax cut.

□ 1745

We are being led to believe that the reason that the Government is shut down is because Democrats and the President will not agree to a 7-year balanced budget using CBO numbers. The real bone of contention is the tax cut, 245 billion dollars' worth for wealthy people, while cutting in half the tax breaks and adding to the taxes of the working poor, people who earn $26,000 a year or less, by repealing half of their earned income tax credit.

I must agree with Senator DOLE—enough is enough. This message comes across loud and clear from my constituents in the Second District of Georgia.

For the second time in 3 months, the U.S. Government ran out of money and

nine Federal agencies serving millions of Americans shut their doors. The shutdown occurred after a short-term funding resolution expired and Republicans failed to pass a fair and equitable funding bill for the various agencies.

The cost to the taxpayers of this budget failure increases every day that the impasse continues. As the Government shutdown enters its 20th day and the cost of that shutdown to the American taxpayer is $50 million each business day, citizens from southwest Georgia are also experiencing this shutdown in other ways.

My constituents are fed up with a shutdown that stops money for the Older Americans Senior Citizens Center, a facility that has provided needed services such as meals and transportation, Meals on Wheels for many senior citizens in Macon, GA; a shutdown that stopped 40 students and teachers from Whigam Elementary School in Whigam, GA from touring the White House, the FBI, the Smithsonian Institute, and from laying a wreath at the tomb of the unknown soldier at Arlington National Cemetery after a 2-year fund-raising effort on their part; a shutdown that stops access to passports for members of the African Methodist Episcopal Church who want to travel to South Africa to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the founding of their church in that country, a Mercer University student from Cordele, GA, who earned a fellowship to study this semester in England; and for a Kendrick High School student in Columbus who could not go to Japan on a nonrefundable ticket that she worked a year to purchase, all because she could not get a passport because of the shutdown; a shutdown that stops many Federal workers from paying house payments, utility bills, car notes, and from buying food and medication for family members.

Mr. Speaker, this is immoral and unconscionable. Enough is enough. It is time for Republicans to offer a funding bill, a fair and equitable funding bill that will reopen the Government and still continue the budget negotiations. Americans have been away from their jobs long enough and without services long enough.

Mr. Speaker, the House should take up and pass H.R. 1643 to end the shutdown of the Government, to return Federal workers to work and restore needed services to American citizens. Then we should pass a fair and equitable balanced budget, 7 years, using CBO numbers, without a tax cut until the budget is balanced.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO FINISH ITS WORK

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, I have the opportunity to travel back to my district every day. I live close enough to home to be able to do that, and I have the chance to talk to my constituents every day and learn firsthand of the hardships that are being caused because of our failure to do our work and get our budget passed on time.

I have had a chance to talk to the people at our veterans hospital, in which supplies are dangerously low, affecting the quality of health care for our veterans; where money for transportation for rehabilitation services is not available to take care of our veterans' needs.

I received a telephone call from a constituent in Howard County, MD who has a FHA-insured mortgage and wants to participate in the mortgage assignment program but cannot find anyone at HUD to make that review because of the furloughs in that agency.

I have talked to a small business owner who trains SSA employees, whose classrooms are closed because of our inability to fund appropriations for that agency. The small business owner is in danger of laying off many of his employees and closing his operation.

This morning I had coffee with a law enforcement officer who is working without pay, whose life is on the line every day, who made some arrests yesterday. I talked to that law enforcement officer for some time. He explained to me the morale issues within his agency.

How do you explain some people working without pay, some people not working without pay, and Federal taxpayers paying their taxes and not receiving Government services? You cannot explain that to our constituents. It is unfair, it is wrong. It is unfair to Federal workers, it is unfair to Federal taxpayers.

And now we hear that the Committee on Rules has recommended a rule that will allow the Speaker to give recess authority so that we will go home with our Federal workers still on furlough, without getting our work done. That is wrong and should not be allowed.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time this evening to inform my colleagues of a resolution that I am filing. This resolution will prohibit us going into a recess or adjournment during any period of a lapsed appropriation for the Federal Government. We should not leave here until we have gotten our work done. It would be unconscionable for us to leave with the appropriations not available to keep Federal offices open.

I hope my colleagues will join me and cosponsor this resolution to make it clear that we will stay here until we get our work done.

Our first order should be to pass a continuing resolution. We should have done that 20 days ago. We should do that first, open up the Government offices, allow Federal taxpayers to get their services for the taxes that they have paid. That should be our first order.

After we have done that, we should negotiate in good faith, be willing to compromise for a budget that, yes, is balanced in 7 years but also protects the priorities that are important to the people of this Nation.

In doing that, I think we do have the framework to reach a bipartisan agreement on a budget. Look at the coalition budget that now is getting much praise. Many of us have been speaking for a long time in favor of that approach and have been looking for help for our colleagues in this House and the Senate. That particular budget provides the opportunity for us to balance the budget within 7 years and hold true to the priorities that are important to the American people.

But we will never get that opportunity unless we restore decent order in our community. That requires us on a bipartisan basis tonight to pass a continuing resolution so that Federal workers can work and that our taxpayers can get the services that they have paid for.

I hope that we can find that bipartisan cooperation in this House so that we can do the people's work, open Government back up and then move forward with the budget of this country.

DEMOCRATS TO CONTINUE TO FIGHT TO SUPPORT MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. CARDIN] in his legislation because I feel strongly we must stay here until we get the job completed. Part of that assignment is to get the Federal workers back to work because this partial shutdown surely does not make any sense at all.

As a Member of Congress, I have had the opportunity to vote in support of a balanced budget amendment and I am proud of it, and we passed it in the House of Representatives. It failed by one vote in the U.S. Senate.

Since I have been a Member of Congress, I have also had the opportunity to support and vote for a line-item veto, and why the Republicans and the Republican leadership would hold it up now simply because we have a Democratic President, and the same Republicans year after year when we had a Republican President in office wanted a line-item veto, and now when we have the opportunity, that window of opportunity to have a line-item veto, we do not have it because the Republicans have held it up.

We have not gotten much credit in the last few years for cutting the budget deficits in half, but we have accomplished that objective by working together. We have downsized the military. The cold war is over. That is a major achievement for the U.S. Congress and something we all ought to be proud of. We have downsized the Federal Government. We needed to do it.

The Federal Government, all governments, need to operate more efficiently.

But I have noticed over the years, particularly the last several years, when the criticisms have come, particularly about government, I do not hear the Republicans pointing their finger at big business and some of the actions they have taken, particularly on mergers and acquisitions and laying off hundreds of thousands of people. I do not hear them saying too much about that. But when it comes to government, about the inefficiencies of government, I sure hear a lot of criticism about government, but not about big business.

Maybe the time has come to get our priorities in order. Maybe the time has come when we ought not to have so much bickering and we should have less partisanship and less acrimony in our dealings with one another. Maybe we ought to have a little more respect for one another on the floor.

I know we have got a lot of new Members. We have got 73 new Republicans since January of 1995, and I know a lot of them think we have not accomplished anything, that everything we have done in the past is wrong. Well, maybe they ought to read our history books, all the way back to June and July of 1776 when at the Continental Congress in Philadelphia our Founding Fathers had to work out their differences in order to sign a document we know of as the Declaration of Independence.

Yes, we have got a lot of friction between the parties and yes, we have a lot of friction within the parties, and we are sure seeking a lot of that now, particularly between the House and the Senate. The Senate Republicans want to put the Federal workers back to work, but not the House Republicans. They want to continue this impasse. They want to continue this gridlock.

We Democrats do want to protect Medicare. Yes, we Democrats want to protect Medicaid and education and the environment. We do not want a tax on our working people. We want to do more for our students, knowing that they need an education in order for us to have a strong middle class for the future. That is why we have been so successful in America, is because we have had a strong middle class, and I assure you the Democrats are going to continue to fight for the middle class because they are the backbone of America.

I am part of a bipartisan group that is meeting now, and we have been meeting almost every day to somehow break this gridlock and this impasse that we presently have. We are talking about policy and substance. We are willing to sacrifice our political and partisan talk for real results.

I urge all my colleagues to work together in the next few days to deliver this important gift to the American people. Let us put the Federal workers back to work, let us balance the budget within 7 years using CBO numbers. We can accomplish all those goals and objectives. But we surely should not have used Federal workers as whipping boys. It serves no useful purpose.

We have a job to accomplish. I know what I am going to do. I am not going to accept a January paycheck until other Federal workers are back to work, and I encourage others to practice the same policy. Maybe if we do not accept our paycheck, maybe we will get more accomplished quicker, faster now.

□ 1800

THE BLANCHFILL FAMILY OF CHULA VISTA, CA: ANOTHER GINGRICH HOSTAGE

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, I want to tell you very briefly the story of yet another Gingrich hostage. Mr. GINGRICH and company are not only shutting down the Government and shutting out Federal employees, they are causing real hardship for real American families, like the Blanchfills of Chula Vista in my district in southern California.

Michael Blanchfill served his country for 20 years as a Navy medic. Several years ago, as he was about to be deployed for Desert Storm, he was diagnosed with Huntington's chorea, a fatal disease.

Michael's wife, Loretta, has been forced to quit her job as a restaurant manager to care for her stricken husband. The Blanchfill's daughters, April and Rachel, also help care for their father, who can barely walk or talk. April has been inspired by her father's illness to study medical technology at Edutec Professional College, but now her studies are threatened because of the lack of funding due to the current shutdown.

The Veterans' Administration Hospital in San Diego should provide therapy for Michael, but now no doctor is available to treat him nor will the VA supply him with a wheelchair during this shutdown, nor will the daycare for Michael be provided. And, of course, no home care will be available to permit Loretta to return to work.

So Michael Blanchfill, a Navy veteran who served his country, desperately needs his country's help. As a medic, he was never taken a prisoner, but now he is a hostage, a Gingrich hostage to extremist demands.

Mr. Speaker and Mr. GINGRICH, let us focus on the real needs of real families like the Blanchfills. Let us pass the necessary resolutions now.

LET US REOPEN THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, while I always appreciate the opportunity to participate in House debate, the format for this afternoon's participation comes not in the context of legislative activity geared at actually addressing the crisis that faces this Government today with the ongoing shutdown, day 20. No, regrettably, the only occasion for my ability to participate in debate this afternoon comes in the form of special orders, open format time for speeches, because no legislative business is presently occurring on the floor of the House.

How can this possibly be that no legislative business is occurring while the Government is shut down, and none other than the Senate majority leader, BOB DOLE, has led an effort and passed it unanimously through the Senate to reopen the Government? Senator DOLE said some very interesting things as that effort succeeded in the Senate. I am going to point to this chart, ''Enough is enough. I do not see any sense in what we have been doing. I would hope that we would have quick action in the House. People have been gone from their jobs long enough.''

In this morning's Washington Post, his quotes contain further elaboration, and again this is the Republican leader in the Senate talking about the shutdown, ''It is not as through Clinton is wincing every day because the Government is shut down. It is not having any impact. If we had a point to make, we made it.''

He goes on to say, again, Senator DOLE goes on to say, ''I know it is sort of macho and all that stuff regarding the shutdown and the standoff and the crisis, but there are human beings out there who are suffering. There are not many rich people working for the Federal Government. They have mortgages to pay, they have vacation plans, they have all kinds of plans. They have illnesses.''

Well, Senator DOLE is precisely correct, and this has raised holy hell with Federal workers all over the country.

But I do not want to just leave the impression that this is about the problems this irresponsible shutdown has caused Federal employees, because it has gone much, much further than that. The House Republican leaders, who have caused this shutdown, have told furloughed workers, ''do not worry, you will be paid.'' Now, we know they have a cash flow crisis right now in the meantime, but they have been assured they will be paid for the days they are not working presently.

Now, there are a lot of other people who are not working today as a result of the shutdown who will not be paid. Every employee of a private contractor who is out of business because of this shutdown will expect no retroactive paycheck. We all know stories. I will tell you about being in Bismarck just a couple of days ago, Bismarck, ND, and there in the coffee shop was a person

absolutely in a quiet room, no one there, no one there, because there were very few employees in the building. Now, that person works for a private contractor. They were there, but others have been laid off, as many, many employees of private contractors have been laid off all over the country.

There is no provision for addressing these people. They are simply out of luck.

Then we get to another very important category, veterans' health care. Imagine if you were lying in a hospital bed critically needing medical care, but also acutely aware that those providing the care were not being paid.

Now, my office checked with the Director of the VA center in Fargo, ND, and he told us that the sick count is going up; fewer and fewer employees actually coming in under these circumstances. He said they are calling in sick, and he is worrying about filling his rotations.

Imagine the concern for the veteran, the hospitalized veterans in our VA system watching this inactivity in the House today and wondering what kind of health care they will get tomorrow, whether the person providing the medical services they so desperately require, doing it without pay, will even show up tomorrow to give the care that is critically needed.

Another major area is housing. You know, many, many housing loans are supported by an FHA guarantee or a VA guarantee. These programs process every single day 2,500 mortgages for FHA and an additional 1,000 for the VA system all over the country. You have got people who have counted on moving, counted on closing real estate deals and getting into their new locations, maybe some of them have even abandoned or made plans to abandon the apartments in which they are presently residing, contemplating timely loan closure, and guess what, the Federal Government is shut down because House Republicans do not agree with BOB DOLE that we need to reopen this Government, and they are out of luck.

Another dimension, there are people struggling with bills, veterans qualifying for these low-interest veterans' loans they want to refinance. There has been a favorable turn in interest rates. They want to refinance. They are up against the wall in terms of monthly cash flow, but guess what, Government shutdown, applications stacking up, nothing being processed, no refinancing, stick with that high interest rate.

The passport dimension of this has raised heck all over the country; unemployment applications; SBA loans. The list goes on and on and on, and that is why Senator DOLE told his colleagues in the Senate, ''Enough is enough.''

I say to my colleagues in the House, enough is enough. Let us reopen this Government.

A BALANCED BUDGET IS MOST IMPORTANT

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

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I think the fact that we have closed Government down is difficult. It is very important for a number of people, but I also would like to say that the importance of getting a balanced budget in this country is even more important.

The budget that we have produced puts money back into people's pockets. It leaves choices to governments, to State and local governments and to individuals. It reduces spending and ceases the mortgaging of our children's future. It ends a number of programs that have absolutely crippled this country. It ends entitlement to programs where funding just continues to go on and on and on.

I do not know if everybody knows what an entitlement is. But an entitlement is a program where we define certain parameters in the law and then if you fit into those parameters, you are entitled to money. And we have a number of these entitlements.

We do not even appropriate specific amount of money. We just say such sums as may be necessary, and we have said to young women that we will give them $18,000 a year if all they will do is just have two children out of wedlock, and then we have promised them they are entitled to that $18,000 a year.

Some of these entitlements absolutely demand that we change them, and it is tremendously important that we do this. The President has simply not cooperated and not followed through with what he said he would do.

At this point in time, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and wanted to make some points that we have heard a lot of speeches about let us reopen the Government.

I want to say to my friends on that side of the aisle, I think there is certainly a good argument for it. We are talking real people, real paychecks, real mortgages, and so forth. I think we need to address that.

I wish they would also have equal fervency to the debt they are passing on to children. If a baby is born today, he or she owes $187,000 as his or her part of the interest on the national debt, $187,000 above and beyond local, State, and Federal taxes.

Now, you know, you talk about compassion. What about the legacy of debt which people do not seem to be worried about passing on to kids? What we are hearing is, of course, ''I supported a balanced budget.'' Well, they do, but not every one of them voted for it. You know, here is, we had the ''yes'' votes from GEREN, HALL, MONTGOMERY, and PARKER when we had the Balanced Budget Act, so from the side over there we only had four ''yes'' votes. That is fine.

A lot of them are saying, ''Well, I support the coalition budget.'' I would say, if you support the coalition budget, then that is very good, too, and that is progress. But there is still a lot who do not support the Republican budget or the coalition budget and are coming down here saying, ''Of course, I support a budget.'' Well, where is it? Hello? The budget negotiations are going on. Go ahead and put your budget in any time now.

We want to get the Government working again. We want to reopen it. But you cannot do it when you have got one side who will not come to the table. So I think it is very, very important to say, OK, you know, let us try to get beyond the Federal Government, you know, and the shutdown, and let us get back to the balancing of the budget.

We have a debt right now that is almost $5 trillion. We spend $20 billion each month in interest on the debt, and I hope that we see some of the urgency that we are seeing on, you know, reopening the Government, I hope we see the equal urgency on let us balance the budget. I think we should have both. I think we should get the Government reopened. But I think we should rush most importantly to balance the budget. I hope our friends would see that.

I know the gentleman from Texas wanted us to yield some time. I do not control the time, but if the gentlewoman would yield, what I would say is we often yield to you but do not get yielded back. So if we do, if the gentlewoman decides to yield to you, I would appreciate it if you would reciprocate back and let me have some of your time so that we can have a dialogue if that is what the gentlewoman desires.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would just say for a moment that I think a lot of people out there are thinking we could get the Government open again, we could get the people back to work, it is just a matter of numbers, why do they not just split the difference in what they want to do with Medicare or Medicaid?

The point that I am trying to make is that it is not just a matter of numbers. It is a fundamental, a totally fundamental difference in the way we view Government, and essentially it does not mean that either are wrong. It means that the Democrats believe in rather a larger role for the Federal Government. The Republicans believe in a more limited role for the Federal Government, and you cannot get there with all of the entitlements.

□ 1815

TIME TO PUT AMERICA BACK TO WORK

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, if I could yield for 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond while the gentlewoman from Kansas, Mrs. MEYERS, was here, because she made a comment. I wanted to just share for the record that as we talk about young people having children, I think we would be remiss if we did not see opportunities that we have here in Congress where we can intervene, and we have not done that.

I know the gentlewoman did not mean to scapegoat innocent children who happen to be born out of wedlock. We could have an opportunity in the Medicaid discussion itself to fund prevention, but we do not do that. Currently we wait until they get pregnant, and then we are able to say, oh, look what is happening. We do not spend money to provide teenagers with family planning and to make sure we intervene in a positive way. That is something we could have the responsibility for.

I just want to put in the record that the gentlewoman and I are held accountable for that.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. If the gentleman would yield for 30 seconds, I would say my main concern is that programs that we initially started and have carried on, that we tried to help people, and instead they have become an incentive for people to join the welfare system. They have become too generous and they have become an entitlement, people know they are there, and they have been abusing the system. That is what I am trying to end.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, if I might, I believe in the House absurdity begets absurdity. This shutdown is obviously one of the most absurd things I have seen. It clearly has accomplished nothing, although it has provided a great deal of hardship, not only for Federal employees but American taxpayers as well.

Last week the senior Senator from Texas, my colleague in the other body, Mr. GRAMM, made a comment asking if anybody noticed whether or not the Federal Government had shutdown. I would take a moment of the House to mention two people who I think did notice that the Federal Government had shutdown. One is Molly Scott, who deals with the contractors at the veterans hospital in Houston, who are not getting paid. Nor is Ms. Scott getting paid. In fact, her apartment house is about to start an eviction notice against her, and her 9-year-old disabled son can no longer go to day care because she does not have any money to pay them.

But it turns out Mr. GRAMM also noticed, because 2 days ago his campaign for the presidency was capable of picking up a check for $4 million from the Federal Elections Commission, which is a so-called entitlement under the law. So it appears that the absurdity of how this Government is being run under the Republican leadership is one where people who go out and work for a living, who have a contract with the Government to work for them, do not get paid for their time, and therefore they cannot pay their creditors; and people who are running for political office can get paid. That certainly makes no business sense, but if it is revolutionary, I think that would be correct.

Let us address a couple of questions about why we are here. This all started when this House under the Republican leadership failed to finish its business, its constitutional business, by October 1, 1995. We did not send any appropriation bills to the President by the beginning of the fiscal year. So far now, 3 months into the fiscal year, we have sent only 10 of 13.

We all know that the process of Government under the Constitution is one of give and take. The fact is that you send the bills to the President, the President can veto or sign those bills, and you work them out. It happened with Ronald Reagan when he was the President and had a Republican-controlled Senate and Democrat-controlled House, it happened with President Bush, and it has happened throughout the history of this Nation.

But to add insult to injury I think is the fact that this Republican leadership decided earlier this year that we would adjourn for the month of August when we had not finished our business. Now we are in this mess. Now they are talking about adjourning until the President gives the State of the Union address without taking care of their business.

There is just simply no excuse for that. We have heard the stories about people, like the folks like Dick Clark, who is with the University of Texas Health Science Center at the Texas Medical Center in my district, who has NIH grants to do research, and they are looking to let people go. Or the businessmen in Houston trying to sell U.S. goods and services overseas, but they cannot get passports to get out of the country to do it.

The fact of the matter is we tried to address this issue. Two weeks ago we tried to bring a compromise budget to the floor using the coalition budget scored by the CBO which actually would add less debt to the Nation and less debt to my children and your children and our grandchildren than the Republican budget, and you blocked it just like you blocked the CR.

Let us do our work. Let us put the country back to work. Let us stop this childish behavior, just like Senator DOLE has said in the Senate.

COME TO THE TABLE, MR. PRESIDENT, AND BRING A BALANCED BUDGET WITH YOU

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I do not doubt that the American citizens are very disturbed about what they see happening in Washington. They are probably wondering, when are the leaders of Congress and the President of the United States going to get together? Is this not a negotiation just as a labor-management negotiation would be?

The fact is, it is not such a negotiation, and that is unfortunate. It should be. The congressional leaders want it to be. The congressional leaders went in with a plan, a budget that had been overwhelmingly approved in both Chambers and had been sent to the President, and which he vetoed.

The President has had no plan. The President, who has signed on the dotted line to say ''yes, I believe in a seven year budget,'' and ''yes, I want that to be scored by the Congressional Budget Office,'' something he had advocated in this Chamber several years ago in a State of the Union Address. But when the President left town and went abroad, his agents came up with no plan.

Finally they submitted a little plan. That little plan was $400 billion in deficit. Now, if you have a $400 billion deficit every year, you are going to add $1 trillion to the national debt essentially in 2½ years, and that will mean we add $4 trillion in a decade to what is already a $5 trillion national debt.

Now, when the President came back, quite correctly, he got away from the aides having the discussion, and meetings were held at the White House. The President participated, the Speaker of the House participated, and the majority leader of the Senate participated. That was all very well. Some days they seemed to be making a little progress. But never has the President submitted a balanced budget. And he probably never will. He has not kept his end of the bargain. He has not kept his word.

Now, in a labor negotiation with management, both sides would go in with their wish list, if you will, and there would be an honest discussion of those wish lists. There would be a discussion of the priorities, what is important to the workers, what is important to management. For the latter, it might be the loosening up of work rules. For labor, it might be additional benefits and an increase in wages.

Unfortunately, this Congress-President negotiation has not been what every labor-management negotiation in America is like. It has been one side—the congressional leadership—coming to the table prepared to bargain with a plan about which they are willing to have an argument. But the other side—the President—has no plan. The other side has no real options, no real offering, to solve the problem.

I think the American people, who are disturbed by gridlock between the executive branch and the legislative branch, want to see their leaders sit down and work it out. Yet that is not happening, and it will not happen until the President comes to the table with a plan.

Unfortunately, on the President's side, some people are still saying, ''Well, why do we need a balanced

budget?'' Well, we need a balanced budget because, as I said earlier, we have a $5 trillion national debt, and if we do not zero out that annual deficit in the next 7 years, we will add another $1 trillion to the national debt. The average child born today, as many have said, already owes $187,000 in their lifetime to pay the interest on the debt. That lifetime payment does not reduce the national debt!

What does a balanced budget mean for the average citizen?

Let us look at a few items just as a Californian might look at them. The holder of the average California home mortgage, which, believe it or not, is about $176,000, would save almost $4,800 per year through lower mortgage interest payments, because a balanced budget by the Federal Government would give confidence to bondholders, to the stock market, and to other financial entities in our country.

How about students? I happen to be a former university president. Student loans are very important to provide educational opportunity for millions of Americans. A California student with an average California loan, which is roughly $4,300 repayable in 10 years, would save $858 in interest payments over the life of the loan. That is based on U.S. Department of Education figures.

A balanced budget for the Nation would result in almost 500,000 jobs being provided in California. The cost of borrowing by local governments would be reduced. The 12 largest cities—including my own city of Long Beach—would save $1.38 billion which could be reinvested in these 12 cities for schools, law enforcement, and public health. In other words, the average citizen would benefit.

Mr. President, get your financial plan—your budget—come to the table, and let us settle this dispute.

EFFECTS OF THE FEDERAL SHUTDOWN

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

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the shutdown of the Federal Government is a national disgrace. Yesterday the Senate acknowledged that enough was enough, that the point had been made, that the issue of a 7-year balanced budget was being actively negotiated, and that it was time to stop the widespread suffering caused by the Government shutdown.

But the extremist right wing in the House seems to have so much contempt for the Government and such indifference to the pain the shutdown is causing, that they will not listen to reason. They think nothing of using the Federal Government as a tool of political blackmail or extortion.

Fortunately, President Clinton has protected his priorities and not caved in to these gangster tactics. In the 104th Congress, President Clinton and congressional Democrats have defended ordinary Americans who rely on programs like Medicare, Medicaid, student loans, and student lunches. Republicans have sought to gut these programs which help millions of people. So it should come as no surprise that they seem indifferent to the plight of millions of people, both clients and Government employees, who have suffered from the Government shutdown.

I spoke to several such people Monday at the Federal Government headquarters in New York City. I met one of my constituents, Ms. Edio Rodriquez, there. She is a single mother trying to raise two children on her own. But this furloughed secretary at the Department of Environmental Protection has not been paid in several weeks. In the Rodriquez household, it was anything but a merry Christmas. The only household income is earned by one of her sons, who is also a college student. He may be forced to take next semester off because he cannot pay his student loans and support the family at the same time.

An employee of the Social Security Administration put it beautifully when she said, ''I don't know the politics of the situation. They aren't clear. The humanity of the situation, or lack of it, is very clear. Working people should be paid, and people who have 23 years of service should not be told to go home and stay home against their will and without a paycheck.''

The indifference of this new majority toward Federal employees is so overwhelming that I may be wasting my breath by talking about the humanity of the situation. But other Americans are being affected, too.

I met my constituent Laurine Fox, a musician who was supposed to be the guest conductor for an orchestra in Bulgaria over the holidays, but Laurine could not get a passport because politicians in Washington are bickering.

I met a woman whose elderly parents immigrated from Europe may years ago and now live in Georgia. They made a pilgrimage to New York to see their names inscribed on the wall at Ellis Island. But Ellis Island was closed, and their sentimental journey was ruined.

It is not just individuals who are being harmed. U.S. manufacturing companies, the city of New York and the U.S. Government stand to lose millions of dollars, because the shutdown is rendering ineffectual the first Hungarian Apparel and Textile Manufacturing Seminar, which is scheduled to take place next Monday in New York. The Hungarians cannot come because they cannot get visas.

Mr. Speaker, this is more than lost business opportunities; it is an international embarrassment.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer ignore the human beings who are suffering from Washington paralysis, like the jeweler who works right across the street from the Federal Building in New York City. His business over the Christmas season was down more than 60 percent. Yet some Members of the Republican majority have said that no one has noticed the Government shutdown. To those right-wing extremists, all I can say is try telling that to the American people. This shutdown is pure malicious insanity.

Mr. Speaker, the blackmail and extortion will not work. It is time for the new majority to stop acting like gangsters and start acting like statesmen.

□ 1830

TELLING HORROR STORIES AND BLAMING REPUBLICANS WILL NOT SOLVE BUDGET PROBLEMS

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, this evening we are hearing a litany of comments about various problems that have arisen with the Government shutdown. I am afraid the other side of the aisle is trying to confuse the issue by citing all these examples.

There is no question about it. The Government shutdown is causing problems, but that is simply confusing the issue, as I said. Talking about ad hominem stories, in other words Government by anecdote, does not really solve the problem. Telling horror stories about some things that are not being done or services that are not being provided does not solve the problem. Just standing there and blaming the Republicans for the problem, does not solve the problem.

I think we have to go back and look at the real issues involved here, and the real issue is the incredible size of the national debt and the size of the budget deficit every year, and the amount of money that we put into paying interest every year.

Mr. Speaker, we have a national debt approaching $5 trillion. That calculates out to about $19,000 for every man, women and child in these United States. And when we consider the number who are working and are able to repay this debt, that balloons to approximately $30,000 per capita.

We pay interest at the rate of $1,000 per year on the national debt for every man, woman and child in the United States; $1,000 per capita. And, once again, if one translates that into the taxpaying citizens, on average each taxpaying citizen is spending well over $1,500 or $1,600 just to pay the interest on the national debt each and every year.

The budget deficits continue, which means the debt gets bigger every year and the interest payments get bigger every year. We simply cannot continue. And that is a fact. That is the real issue here. It is not the horror stories about the Government being shut down, the issue is our national debt.

We have proposed, Mr. Speaker, that we achieve a balanced budget in 7 years

using honest numbers. That is a very modest goal, but that is something that the Republicans have proposed, and that is something that the Congress has passed and sent to the President.

In November, the President promised that within 30 days he would present a balanced budget that met those criteria, balanced in 7 years using honest numbers. December 15, when his proposal was supposed to be unveiled, it did not balance. it was out of balance by a large amount, according to the Congressional Budget Office, which analyzes these things.

In the meantime, the House and the Senate passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1995. It passed on October 26. The President vetoed it. I can understand his philosophical problems with some of the issues, but I do believe he has an obligation to negotiate seriously and to present to the negotiators his version of a balanced budget. That has not come forth even up to this point.

As a result, the Government has shut down in an attempt to force the issue. It simply has not worked. He has still not presented a balanced budget. I am reaching the conclusion that the President does not want to balance the budget and he is not going to present his version of a balanced budget. I believe that is tragic given the enormity of the problem. He will not sign our balanced budget, he will not present one of his own, what do we then do?

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious problem for this Nation, and it is a very serious problem for this Congress. We are trying to address it, and perhaps we have to take another track if the President simply will not respond and will not present a balanced budget of his own. After all, the House is the body that initiates the legislation dealing with appropriations. That is prescribed in the Constitution.

Perhaps what we have to do is present to the President bite-sized budgets. Maybe we should call them mini budgets, dealing with one issue at a time and saying, Mr. President, this is all we can afford to spend on this particular item in this fiscal year and ask him to sign each of these, almost a line-item budget, if we like. And maybe if we put it in bite-sized chunks, he will be able to understand the problem, we will be able to deal with it, and we can achieve a balanced budget in that fashion.

In any event, we have to take another approach, something that he will understand given the fact that he simply will present a balanced budget to us and will not sign the one that we have prepared.

So I urge all of us to look at this afresh, and I especially urge the President to work with us and negotiate in good faith as we try to solve this enormous national problem.

REPUBLICAN LEADERSHIP ABDICATING ITS RESPONSIBILITIES FOR GOVERNANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by saying that partisanship has never been the major reason that I have been serving in this Congress, and I think, over the years, I have tried very hard in my career to build bridges across the aisle on all the committees I have served on and build bridges between regions and representatives from different regions of the country. But as I witness the current impasse, and have never seen anything like it in my career, I would have to say that we have a serious problem within the Republican Party.

This week we saw that the Senate, which is in Republican control, pass a bill to end the shutdown, this historic shutdown of the Federal Government. As we have seen workers temporarily laid off, without checks, across this country, the House Republicans cannot find it in either their management or their personal skills to pass the bill that was passed in the Republican Senate.

So my question this afternoon, with all due respect, is what is wrong with the Republican leadership in this Chamber that is abdicating its responsibilities for governance? I would say it is not only the budget that needs to be balanced, but, I think, it is the Republican leaders in this House that are out of balance, and it has gotten to the point where it is not just the Federal workers that are being affected, but the taxpaying public of this country that is being denied services.

Let me say in that regard, as someone who has taken a lifelong career interest in veterans affairs, that today I received a communication at my request from the Veterans Hospital in my region of the country, which has jurisdiction over the Ann Arbor Medical Center, as well as the Toledo Veterans Outpatient Clinic in my own home district, and I asked the chief of medical services there, Dr. Lloyd Jacobs, for a report on what was happening in our region of the country, and learned that the personal in that particular hospital, in our outpatient clinic as well, received paychecks with less than half of their normal amount, as only time worked before December 15 was credited for pay.

In fact, in those checks deductions were taken out in full, and that accounted for significantly less than half a paycheck in many instances.

Dr. Jacobs indicated to me that this has caused very significant hardship for people working in our clinic and hospital. For example, a clinical pharmacist, who is the sole supporter of two young children, is already having trouble meeting mortgage payments for that family. Another single mom in that hospital, with a 13-year-old child, is seriously worried about adequate food until the next paycheck. And one employee told him about the fact that she was unlikely to be able to come to work because she was having difficulty buying gas and she really did not have her full payment.

Before I recognize the esteemed member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs here, let me just say that the doctor told me that his staff is now so demoralized, sufficiently distressed, and distracted that he has recommended, as medical center director in our region of the country, that they are going to diminish medical services to our veterans, including cutting back and stopping reconstructive vascular surgery, cardiothoracic surgery, interventional cardiology, and other risky and stressful procedures, because he is worried about the people who support him in the operating rooms concentrating on the operations they are supposed to be performing on our veterans. He wrote me saying he hopes this is temporary and can we not do something here in Washington so that he can begin doing the job the taxpayers expect him to do, and that is to operate on the veterans in our region who are seeking medical care.

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me. What she said is exactly true, and is happening in all our 171 veterans hospitals across the country. We are really headed for a disaster unless we come up with something to pay these people, to pay our bills on surgical equipment, medicines, and the things we have to use and do to be sure that these veterans get the proper medical care.

It is a problem. I congratulate the gentlewoman for pointing it out. We have to do something. We have to pass a continuing resolution to take care of these veterans hospitals. If we do not, we are not taking care of those that marched off and did a great job for our country and have served well. I appreciate the gentlewoman's yielding.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, who has served in this Chamber with honor for many, many years, has he ever seen anything like this before?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Never in my 30 years.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for that.

All I can say is that one quality seems to be missing in this Chamber, and that is good measure, good measure, on the part of the Republican Party. And if I could plead with the Members who are here on the floor, please heal your wounds, take us away from this edge of brinkmanship. Pass the bill that the Senate has sent over here.

TRIBUTE TO 100TH BIRTHDAY OF SENATOR EVERETT DIRKSEN

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to respond quickly to my friend from Ohio, and I think it is important that we recognize that, yes, it is true nothing like this debate has taken place, and yet if our Founding Fathers were here today, they would say, wait a minute, let me get this straight, we are almost $5 trillion in debt; we spend $20 billion each month in interest on the debt; if a child is born today he or she owes $187,000 as his or her portion of the interest just on the debt, above and beyond local, State and Federal taxes? I think our Founding Fathers would be shocked and appalled that we are even negotiating a 7-year balanced budget and not an immediate balanced budget.

This is a tremendous moment in history that we have got to address, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, and I would have done this earlier had I not been in the Chair most of the day, to insert into the RECORD an article that appeared in my hometown newspaper, the Peoria Journal Star. Today commemorates the 100th birthday of one of the greatest leaders of the U.S. Senate, Senator Everett Dirksen.

I do not think it could be really more fitting for me to be inserting this article and commemorating the 100th birthday of Senator Dirksen, because many people have used the quote that he said, ''A million here, a million there. Pretty soon it adds up to real dollars.'' This is what we have been talking about for so long around here, the idea of a balanced budget.

Senator Dirksen lived in the district that I represent, and at one time he was the Congressman from the district that I now represent. He hailed from Pekin, IL, and when he died in 1969 was the minority leader of the Senate; and, actually, prior to being elected to the Senate, was the Congressman who became ill, retired from the House, was cured of his illness, which was an eye problem, and then returned as a U.S. Senator, and had a distinguished career serving under President Johnson, who was a very close friend of his.

Nobody knew more about trying to balance budgets, working with Members on both sides, trying to reach agreement and compromise than Senator Dirksen, and I do want to insert this article in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to yield to my friend from California, who was actually a staffer in the Senate during the time that Senator Dirksen was the minority leader, and I would ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] would have any comments with respect to Senator Dirksen.

□ 1845

Mr. HORN. Just briefly, Mr. Speaker. Senator Dirksen, without question, was one of the great legislators of the twentieth century. That is why his colleagues in the Senate named one of the three buildings of the Senate after him.

I spent a good part of 1965 in his back office as assistant to the Republican whip, Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, who was his principal deputy, and there is no question the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was completely drafted in Senator Dirksen's back office by a joint bipartisan team from the Johnson administration, the Democratic majority leader, the Republican whip and the Republican leader.

When we finished one day and his chief counsel announced to the Senator we were done, he said, ''Get me the President.'' When his secretary did, he said ''Lyndon? Everett. You now have a bill that you can send to the Congress of the United States.''

That was the first major legislation since before the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration completely drafted in the Senate. Senator Dirksen was also the key person on the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Without Everett Dirksen's leadership, there would have been no Civil Rights Act. We had to break a southern Democratic filibuster of 18 Senators, and it took 1 year to do it and Dirksen's leadership is what got the job done.

Earlier in the House, Dirksen proved himself to be a true legislative craftsman. More than anyone else in the House, he was responsible for passing the only reorganization act in this century pertaining to Congress. That was the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946.

So, it is correct that my friend from Illinois honors a great legislator and a great human being.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I would also add, and I appreciate very much the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] participating in this commemoration of the 100th birthday of Senator Everett Dirksen, who was, as I said, from Pekin, IL.

I would also add that in the last 1960s, when Senator Dirksen was the minority leader in the U.S. Senate, that was the end of the decade when we had balanced budgets around here. Since that time we have had a very difficult time balancing our budget. As I said, the quote that has been used so often I think really deserves to be attributed to Senator Dirksen. I appreciate the opportunity to commemorate his 100th birthday today.

[From the Peoria Journal Star, Jan. 4, 1996]

DIRKSEN BROUGHT SENSE OF REALITY WHEREVER HE WENT

One hundred years ago, fathers might have dreamed that a son born in a log cabin could become president. But no way could Johann Dirksen have imagined Jan. 4, 1896, that his baby boy's birthday celebrations one day would launch the social season in the nation's capitol.

Yet, Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen's birthday bash, usually at the Mayflower hotel ballroom, was the opening ''must go'' event of the social season each year in Washington, D.C., even before he became minority leader of the Senate and a national figure beyond the Beltway. Everybody who was anybody, as the saying goes, attended from both political parties and from the administration and the congress.

Those glittering parties were a long way from the neighborhood in Pekin known as ''Beantown.'' Yet, growing up in Beantown may have been an important part of ''Ev'' Dirksen being the toast of the town in the nation's capitol.

Actually, the residents, themselves named it that—or rather in their own language, ''Bohnchefiddle.'' They were German immigrants who didn't indulge in euphemisms. They had a strong sense of reality. And the reality was that rich folks had flower gardens in their yards; immigrants grew beans. They were who they were, and saw nothing wrong with it. Beantown was just their American starting place.

In fact, most residents in Pekin, and millions more across America, gardened town lot was 50 feet front, 150 deep, and provided space for people who didn't own a horse and didn't need a barn. There was space for berry bushes along the lot line, half a dozen fruit trees set wide apart, orderly squares of garden vegetables, and a grape arbor.

There was a lot more than beans, and it all required care. Many folks kept a small flock of chickens by the back porch as well. At one time, in fact, the Dirksens raised a pig.

The bigger boys spaded the gardens and raked them smooth. Before he was old enough for school, the youngest son, Ev, could help punch holes in the prepared ground with the wooden split pegs used as clothespins keeping a straight line along the board on which he knelt.

Keeping clothes as clean as possible was important when washing them was a major weekly chore. As the produce grew, ripening in sequence, much of it had to be ''put up'' for the winter in fruit jars and glasses, sealed with hot paraffin or special lids, after being well cooked. Cabbage was chopped and salted and then pounded and pounded until it was soaked in its own brine to be kept for winter—sauerkraut.

The Dirksen boys took part, and it was the boys who peddled surplus vegetables door to door. The basics of life to the German families were food, clothes, shelter from the cold and cleanliness. So, before he learned to read and write, Everett Dirksen became part of a family team, doing his share in providing those basics, and grew up knowing from whence came the necessities of life. Somebody had to do the work to produce it.

Their father had a stroke in 1901 when Ev, the youngest, was only 5. By the time Ev was 9, Dad was dead. The boys were raised by their mother, and the team game of survival that they played put a solid foundation under his whole life.

In those circumstances and in the absence of radio, television, telephones or computers, he found school and learning downright fun. Learning was an adventure and a kind of game. He loved reading. He loved to discover a new big word and roll it off his tongue. In books, he could explore the far reaches of this world and of the world of ideas.

Thus in his youth, and progressively thereafter, Everett Dirksen combined those wonderful opposites, the contradictions of idealist and a realist. It fit the Lincoln tradition of central Illinois.

With his older brothers grown and earning money, the family could let young Everett go off to college. He worked nights while

schooling at the University of Minnesota, until World War I interrupted.

Three years of ROTC there gave him a leg up on a lieutenant's bars. In France, he was an artilleryman. His job was to ride a wicker basket under a rough, hydrogen-filled balloon, held by a cable and linked by a primitive telephone to the gun batteries, overlooking the battlefield. There, he observed the fall of the artillery shells his battery mates were firing and tell them how to adjust their fire to bring it on target.

Of course, such balloons like his were sitting ducks, even for the primitive planes of the time.

When the war ended, the army found his ability to speak German useful and kept him in Europe. He remained overseas for 18 months in all, much of the time interpreting for others or dealing directly with the local German population. He also knew Paris, Berlin, other German cities, and visited England and Ireland. In Rome, the ambassador asked him to join his staff, but Ev was homesick for Pekin.

Thus, young Lt. Dirksen returned to Pekin and Bohnchefiddle at age 24, with an extraordinary range of experiences. He was now a college man, a combat veteran and an ex-officer who had traveled, often in very sophisticated circles, in postwar Europe.

Back home, he married a Pekin girl and launched his remarkable political career as the youngest person ever elected to the Pekin City Council.

As city councilman, he was a young man dealing with a rapidly changing world. Streets needed to be paved for the growing number of those new motor cars. The fire department needed trucks to replace the horse-drawn rigs. The aging streetcar, one car running back and forth on a single track, needed replacement with bus service.

Power plant were under construction bringing electricity. The Edison resolution was on, and radio was waiting in the wings. These were not hypothetical or abstract problems to be solved abstractly for the young councilman. He was intimately involved with the reality of finance for technology and the even tougher reality of the effects and demands new technology and dramatic change made on the city workers and the public.

When he grappled with these problems as a councilman, he also worked delivering his brothers' bread to 50 small groceries scattered about town. Everybody knew his route, and at many a stop he confronted people with problems to take to their councilman. Before he went to the national macrocosm, this man had a thorough and heavy dose of the microcosm.

Thus, the nature of the man was well-founded long before he became one of that city's best-loved figures, before he crafted the Civil Rights Bill of 1964 and brought over the votes to pass it with him, before he won a Grammy for recording ''Gallant Men,'' before he was the confidante of presidents both Republican and Democrat, and before he became a darling of the once-skeptical Washington press corps.

He brought to Washington the prestige of being the Congress' best orator, a skill founded and practiced in Pekin and which largely won for him his original seat in the House of Representatives in the first place.

He also brought the attention to detail, the realism, of Bohnchefiddle, and was, undoubtedly, the most skilled parliamentarian in the Senate of his time. He knew how the system worked in every detail, and he knew who was the person that counted, the person to talk to, not only in the Senate, but in every department of the national administration.

Finally, he made many friends and no enemies in the best tradition of the small town where he grew up, and where some of his local political foes were also lifelong personal friends.

When Everett Dirksen died, the President of the United States gave the eulogy—proclaiming that Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen had more impact on history than many presidents.

That he was, and he didn't learn that in Washington. That was the boy from Bohnchefiddle.

SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few observations. Observation No. 1 is that I believe that the struggle we are in is a very significant and fundamental one. This is not a testosterone test. It is not an ego test. It is a fundamental struggle.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the 7-year balanced budget plan offered by my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, it contains three significant features.

No. 1, they significantly change the function, nature, and role of the Federal Government in the lives of people in this country. Nothing can be more fundamental than redefining the nature and the role of the Federal Government. I would argue that when we put down the Articles of Confederation and moved to a constitutional government, that brilliant minds thought that it was an important function, the role of the Federal Government in people's lives. To redefine that is very fundamental.

Second, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle want to significantly reduce the size of the Federal Government and, third, significantly reduce the revenues designed to carry out the business of Federal governance.

Nothing can be more fundamental than that struggle. The give and take that is necessary to resolve those fundamental problems, in this gentleman's humble opinion, cannot be dealt with in the context of an artificial crisis that wreaks havoc and brings pain and creates peril in the lives of people who offer the services and people who receive the services of the Federal Government.

We ought to dignify the significance of this fundamental struggle by moving beyond this crisis, and I would echo the sentiments of many of my colleagues who suggested we ought to pass a continuing resolution, and yet with all due respect, I think my colleagues are going in the wrong direction.

The first factor that contributed to the deficit was the $260 some odd billion tax cut to the wealthy during the Reagan era. But rather than pass a simplified progressive tax based on the notion that the people most able to pay, pay the most, what we see here is a bill that passed the House that originally had a tax cut of $305 billion. Now we are talking about a tax cut of $245 billion to the wealthy. Been there. Done that. That is a mistake.

No. 2, the rapid rise in the military budget during the Reagan era that took us from $170-some-odd-billion climbed up over $300 billion and leveled out for the 10 years of the decade of the 1980's. We find ourselves in the context of a post-cost war world where we ought to be downsizing the military budget, but what does this budget do? It added $7 billion over and above the President's request, and it adds to the military budget during a period when the United States and its allies outspend the rest of the world 4 to 1. It seems to me that that is going in the wrong direction.

The third contributing factor to the deficit was the rapid rise in health care costs. But rather than us embrace a national health care policy based upon the principles of comprehensiveness and universality, what we see here is a challenge to Medicare, a challenge to Medicaid, and no effort to bring this country to the 21st century with a coherent, rational and comprehensive approach to national health care.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, a major contributing factor to the deficit is high unemployment. Depending upon which economist we subscribe to, for each point we reduce the unemployment rate, we reduce the budget deficit by $25 to $55 billion each point we drop, but rather than embrace a policy of full employment, we embrace a policy of restricting employment, and I would suggest that jobs are not created in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker.

A society generates employment to the extent to which we are prepared to come together to solve other social problems. We address the problems of transportation in this country; you generate employment in the field of transportation. We address the issue of education in this country; we generate employment. My point is that to the extent to which we are prepared to spend resources to solve the social problems of this country, we solve that problem and we generate employment. The 7-year budget plan in my opinion goes in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying the process is flawed. We have created an incredible crisis here and, No. 2, on substance we are going down the wrong road that does not take us toward reduction of the deficit. Ultimately, I think it is going to contribute to it.

MR. PRESIDENT, IT IS TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I came down out of my apartment this morning and picked up the Washington Post on the front porch and, as I looked through it, I turned finally to page A–

11 and in the Washington Post was this article. It says, ''On Balance, Budget Deal Could Offer a $1,000 Bonus'' to each family in America.

Then a few minutes ago, frankly, I had not read it, but a few minutes ago I heard the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] talking about the effect of the balanced budget, the effect that it would have on our families by relieving a payment that they would have to make to the Federal Government each and every year to pay the interest on the national debt.

I went back and read this and it says something different, and I will tell my colleagues about it in a minute, but I think it is very important to put this in the context of what the gentleman was talking about.

See, the national debt has risen to approximately $5 trillion. Now, that for me and my colleagues, for me at least, that is an incomprehensible figure. I do not know, I cannot put $5 trillion into context. But when you look at it, as the gentleman from Michigan was, what he was saying is that if you take the $5 trillion national debt and figure out what each of our share of that is; in other words, divide $5 trillion by 260 million people which represents the number of people that live in our country, we find out that each of our share of the national debt is about $18,000.

Now, to bring that just a little closer to home, we can all relate to this. If we went down to the bank, if we went to our hometown bank and we said ''I need for some purpose to borrow $18,000,'' the banker would say, fill out the application, and we need to make you aware, because the State and Federal laws provide that we disclose to you, that it is going to cost you an annual sum, an interest payment. And if on your $18,000 we charge you 7 percent interest, 7 percent of 18,000, if I am doing my math right, is close to $1,200 a year.

Mr. Speaker, what that means is that for each of our individual shares of the national debt, which is $18,000, just like we would have to pay the bank interest, we have to pay our share of the interest on the national debt. So, when we make out our income tax checks on April 15 of each year, somewhere between $1,100 and $1,200, which the gentleman from Michigan pointed out correctly, goes out of each of our pockets to pay the interest on this debt that we have further accumulated.

On to this article, ''On Balance, the Budget Deal Could Offer a $1,000 Bonus.'' This is alluding to the fact that there are other savings which families will be able to reap. For example, because of lower national debt, each family will save an average of $500 a year by the year 2002.

In addition to that, because interest rates will drop according to most economists by about 2 percent, according to most estimates, that the economy will begin to grow, and economists project that additional income will be earned by families of somewhere between $400 and $600 a year. Take the lower figure. Just take the $400. Then they say in addition to that, because interest rates will be lower, our mortgages, our mortgage payments will be lower; our car payments will be lower; our student loan payments will be lower. That would amount to, on average, another $100.

So, if we add $500 in savings to $400 in savings to another $100 in savings, in addition to the check we would no longer have to write to the Federal Government of $1,100 or $1,200 a year, this article says that we would get an additional bonus of about, on average, $1,000 per family.

Mr. Speaker, this begins to make a real difference to the middle-class families that I represent. An additional couple of thousand dollars of savings a year amounts to real money. It is our job. This is what this debate has really been all about for all of these months for the last year. We have been trying to arrive at a consensus between Republicans and Democrats as to how we can balance the budget to save American families these moneys.

So, I commend this article to everyone's reading. It is on page A–11 of today's Washington Post written by Steven Pearlstein and it is news analysis. I think it is very accurate and I think it is something that we should be able to relate to on an individual basis, dealing with the national debt, how it affects each and every one of the families that I represent and that my colleagues represent.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us proceed together. We have bickered long enough about this subject. It is too important. The President knows it. He has committed to balancing the budget in 7 years using what we here in Washington call real numbers, what my constituents call numbers without smoke and mirrors, and we have also agreed to that on, I think, both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, let us proceed to do it so that American families can actually realize the bonus that is pointed out in this article.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following newspaper article for the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1996]

ON BALANCE, BUDGET DEAL COULD OFFER A $1,000 BONUS

(By Steven Pearlstein)

With the budget crisis slowly suffocating Washington and mystifying the rest of the country, it may be easy to overlook the payoff if President Clinton and leaders of the Republican Congress agree on a plan that balances the budget.

The benefits could total roughly $1,000 a year for every American family, according to economists and budget analysts.

The math goes something like this: Balancing the budget stems the flow of income that now runs from future generations to our own.

At today's interest rates, the $1 trillion in government debt that would be avoided by gradually eliminating the deficit over the next seven years would save taxpayers $60 billion in interest payments every year. That works out to an average of $500 a year for every household beginning in 2002—money that could be used to reduce taxes or increase the government services they receive.

Balancing the budget also should generate extra economic growth from lower interest rates and a higher national savings rate. Even if the effect is just an additional 0.1 percent in output each year, as the Congressional Budget Office predicts, it would boost national income by one percentage point by the end of a decade—$400 for the average household.

Additionally, the CBO calculates that balancing the budget will reduce prevailing interest rates by about 1.5 percent. Some of that reduction already is reflected in market rates, but with average household indebtedness now running around $45,000, including mortgages, lower rates eventually could reduce interest payments by $675 a year per family.

But not all of those savings will make their way to our bank accounts. That's because the flip side of interest savings for borrowers is a corresponding reduction in interest income for savers. Over the course of a lifetime savers and borrowers turn out to be many of the same Americans. But even so, it's pretty safe to figure about another $100 annual bonus per family for balancing the budget.

All told, it's worth about $1,000 a year to our children and grandchildren for us to cut back on our consumption of government subsidies and services. ''From an economic standpoint, everything else about this budget debate is insignificant,'' says William Niskanen, President Reagan's economic adviser and now chairman of the Cato Institute.

But while the future payoff is fairly clear, the process of getting there is not without pain. Nobody has yet invented a way to suck a trillion dollars out of the economy over seven years without anyone noticing. Indeed, some economists predict if spending is cut too fast, it could tip the economy into recession.

Even if the economy can withstand the shock of sharply reduced government spending, there are two groups of people for whom this budget debate has serious consequences: the poor and the elderly.

The big nut to be cracked is health care costs, which effectively represent half of the policy dispute between the president and the Republican Congress. What they're really wrestling with is how to ration medical care for the 60 million Americans who rely on government to pay for it.

Although rationing is a dirty work in politics, it goes on every day all over the United States, where more than half the working population is now enrolled in some form of managed health care plan.

The key feature of these plans is that a group of doctors and hospitals agrees to provide all medically necessary services for a fixed fee per person per year. This fixed-fee concept has helped slow the medical inflation rate to its present 4 percent. But the government's two big health care programs, Medicare and Medicaid, continue to operate largely on the blank check philosophy of health insurance, giving the poor and elderly free reign to consume whatever health services they think they need and reimbursing doctors and hospitals according to a fee schedule.

Both Clinton and Congress have effectively embraced the idea of extending the managed-care concept to Medicare and Medicaid. What the fuss is all about is how—and how fast.

The other big sticking point concerns the rest of the government's social safety net. While just about everyone concedes that welfare programs have largely failed to end poverty, few can point to alternative programs

that work much better. Any reform, then, is something of a leap into the unknown, and at the heart of the budget battle is the question of exactly how big a leap to take.

It was candidate Clinton who first promised to end welfare as we know it, and now the Republican Congress has gone him one better. Its proposal would fold welfare, food stamps and a panoply of other federal programs into one, consolidated grant to be sent off to each statehouse. The Republican plan is exquisitely precise on how and when welfare mothers will be forced off the dole, but considerably more vague on exactly how these people will find jobs or how they will pay for day care and health care even if they do.

''What concerns me in all this is the treatment of the poor,'' says Charles Schultze of the Brookings Institution, the top economic adviser to President Carter. ''For them this represents a terribly risky roll of the dice—one that I think is likely to come out wrong.''

It is not only economists with Democratic leanings who worry about the budgetary impact on the poor. Listen to Herbert Stein, an analyst at the American Enterprise Institute and an economic adviser to President Nixon:

''If you cut Medicaid and welfare and food stamps, will these people descend into misery or straighten up, fly right, get a job and wind up with an apartment on Park Avenue? Frankly, I think it's a risky strategy for the very poorest people. I think many won't be able to adjust successfully.''

But if doing something is risky, so is doing nothing. Even the supposedly harsh measures proposed by the Republicans will keep the federal budget in balance only for the first decade or so of the 21st century. After that, demographic forces will once again overwhelm the Treasury as the giant baby boom generation moves into its retirement years, expecting the same level of pensions and health care as the generation that preceded it. Without further increases in taxes or reductions in Social Security and Medicare benefits, the government is now projected to once again find itself drowning in red ink.

''Even if we can balance the budget in the next few years, it is really only the first step,'' warns Stanford University's Michael Boskin, top economist in the Bush White House. ''What lies beyond the year 2002 simply dwarfs what we are dealing with here.''

Put another way, if you think this budget battle is tough, wait till next time.

COUNTERING THE REPUBLICAN SPIN ON THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WYNN. Mr. Speaker, today is day 20 of the Government shutdown and the spin coming from the Republican side goes something like this: Well, you know, it is not really our shutdown. It is President Clinton's shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it very clear to the American people that nothing could be further from the truth. The President does not have the power to end this shutdown. He can take no unilateral action, because if he could, he would. But he can take no unilateral action that will end this shutdown. It is not his shutdown.

The only way he can shut it down is toe acquiesce to the Republicans' demands. It is in fact the shutdown of the Gingrich Republicans, because they have the power by virtue of being in the majority and by virtue of having the votes to pass a clean continuing resolution which could put Government employees back to work. Let there be no mistake. This is a Gingrich Republican shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, the second spin we hear is in reality it is just bickering and really both sides are at fault. That is not true. We have 198 votes to put Federal employees back to work, to pay contractors for work that they do for our country. But it is not just Democrats. In the Senate, Mr. DOLE says enough is enough. So, on the Senate side both Democrats and Republicans are willing to put Federal workers back to work, and House Democrats are ready to put Federal employees back to work.

It seems to me it is clear that this is not a matter of more partisan bickering.

□ 1900

So what is it? It is an attempt by a few self-styled Republican revolutionary hard-liners and extremists to dictate the terms of the budget debate. They are essentially saying, ''If the President does not accept our budget terms, then we will keep the Government shut with all the attendant harms that go along with that.''

Let me digress for a minute, because one of these revolutionaries got on the floor and talked about, ''Well, gee, it is not a problem because the banks are going to provide emergency mortgage relief.''

No. 1, that acknowledges that there is in fact an emergency but, No. 2, that is not what banks are for. In this country banks are supposed to enhance our economic vitality. The money they are giving out to Federal employees because of their emergency could more better be spent expanding our economy, providing small business loans, or helping new home buyers, instead of bailing out people that the Republican hard-liners put in trouble.

But let us go to the meat of the issue, the balanced budget. Again, the Republican revolutionaries get on the floor and say, ''This sacrifice is worth it, because ultimately we are going to fundamentally change the way business is done in this country.'' That is right. More for the wealthy, less for the seniors, less for the poor, less for children.

The specifics of the budget break down this way, and this is why the President does not like it and I do not like it, either. They want to give $245 billion of tax breaks to the wealthy. They say, ''Oh, no, that's not true, we just want to send money back home to the people.''

Well, here are the facts. According to the Treasury Department, half of the $245 billion would go to people making over $100,000 a year. So some $120 billion plus is going to people making over $100,000 a year.

Folks, that comes to about 4 percent of the population. So it breaks down like this: 4 percent of the population is going to get half of the tax breaks in their so-called balanced budget, which amounts to about $100 billion. That is not fair.

On the other side of the coin, they want to take $270 billion out of Medicare, the program for the seniors, and about $160 billion out of Medicaid, the program for the poor and the disabled. Let us think about it. If we did not have to give the big tax break to the wealthy 4 percent, we would have to take a lot less money out of the pockets of the seniors and the poor and the disabled.

That is the meat of this debate, and this is why the President says their budget is unacceptable. If they would give up some of the tax breaks, we could have a balanced budget. There are many of us on this side of the aisle who want a balanced budget in 7 years using the so-called real numbers. We can do that. We do not need to shut down the Government and we do not need to give a big tax break to the wealthy.

Who is being cheated in all this? The taxpayer. Remember, these are not President Clinton's employees, these are not the Democrats' employees. There are our employees, they are the taxpayers' employees, and quite frankly these people are not at work, they are not doing the taxpayers' business. They are not providing Federal home loan assistance; 2,500 applications are not being processed. They are not providing renewals of vouchers for moderately priced homes.

They are not providing services to small businesses. Two hundred and sixty small business applications a day are not being processed through the SBA. Ninety small businesses a day are not being able to bid for contracts because of this Government shutdown. And on and on its goes.

Ladies and gentlemen, the balanced budget is a real issue, but the Government shutdown is a false issue created by so-called revolutionaries who somehow believe that the ends justify the means, and they do not care who is harmed in the process.

REPUBLICANS WANT A BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Maryland who just preceded me said that this impasse has occurred because of the Republican Party, the majority in Congress, wants to give tax breaks to the wealthy. That is simply not the truth.

The truth is this impasse has occurred because the majority of this Congress, both the House and the Senate, want a balanced budget in 7 years.

The President signed Public Law 104–56, and I would like to read that.

It says, ''The President and the Congress shall enact legislation in the first session of the 104th Congress to achieve a balanced budget not later than the fiscal year 2002 as estimated by the Congressional Budget Office.''

The fact is the President does not want a balanced budget. The President's extremist liberal agenda and the extremist liberal agenda of Democrats on this side of the aisle simply cannot go forward with a balanced budget, because their agenda costs more than the money that we have coming into the Congress.

That would leave us with two alternatives. We would have to increase taxes to support that agenda that the President insists upon, and continue to go deeper and deeper into debt, thus mortgaging our children's future, selling our children out. We have all heard the saying, ''Fool me once, shame on you. Fool me twice, shame on me.''

The President has introduced four budgets. None of them have been balanced. The most nearly balanced was $87 billion in the red. Two of those unbalanced budgets came after he signed into law that he would balance the budget. His actions show that he is not a man that can be taken at his word. Character counts. When you say something, and then go on and sign into law something that you say you will do and then act in bad faith in these negotiations by refusing any attempt to reach a compromise, then that is character.

We are described, all of the Republican freshman, as extremist radicals. The fact is all we are asking for is a balanced budget in 7 years based on CBO numbers. That is all we are asking for. That is why that impasse is here. That is why the Government is not open. Everything else is open for negotiation. Everything. The level of tax cuts is open. Medicare is open. Welfare reform. Everything is open for negotiation. The only thing where we will not compromise is on balancing the budget, because we are committed to the future of this country. We are committed to our children and our grandchildren, and we want them to be able to have at least as good a life as we have had.

The President said he vetoed our appropriations bill because we cut Medicare too much. Let me take you back in history about 18 months ago when Hillary Clinton was proposing health care reform.

What was stated between Hillary Clinton and the President at that time was, ''My opponents will say that I am cutting Medicare, but that's not true. All we want to do is to slow the growth in Medicare from 11 percent to between 6 and 7 percent.''

That is what Bill Clinton and Hillary Clinton said 18 months ago. Our proposal is higher and spends more money on Medicare than their proposal said only 18 months ago.

This is a transparent excuse to have vetoed the bill. This is pure and simple not wanting to balance the budget.

We have to face that, and we have to get the President to tell the truth about what his intentions are. At least he has to put something on the table so that we will have a point to negotiate from.

I urge all Members to continue on insisting on a balanced budget and, remember, everything else is up for negotiation once the President will give us a balanced budget to work from.

BUDGET DISPUTE IS INSANITY

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I had made some effort to stay out of this dispute to the extent that I could in terms of the debate, but several of my constituents have called and expressed severe concern about the direction that we are headed and concern that I had not been as vocal on this issue as they expected me to be as their Representative.

The people who called me are real citizens of this country. They are constituents of mine in my congressional district. They are a Federal prison guard who is continuing to work because he has a critical position in the prison system, and despite the fact that he continues to work, he is not now being paid on a timely basis. Although he acknowledges that he may be paid in the future, he asked me, ''What should I tell my creditors in the meantime?'' And I had no answer for him.

They are VA hospital employees who care for our veterans, and live in my congressional district and work at a VA hospital located in my congressional district, who continue to provide services to their patients at veterans hospitals but are not currently being paid.

They are people who had a real estate closing scheduled to close so that they could avoid a foreclosure on their house, and when they got ready to close, they were advised that the FHA had closed its doors and they could not close their loan.

They are people who had sought to go to England for a special training program, who were advised that they could not be issued a passport for this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity that they had been provided.

I had no answers for them, because I have thought that all along this dispute is absolutely insane. There is little if any connection between the continuing operation of the Federal Government and the resolution of the larger budget issue that we face.

Notwithstanding that, my Republican colleagues have succeeded in, as they always do, reducing this major dispute to a one-sentence simple-minded kind of expression—''Let's have a 7-year balanced budget.''

Well, they told us that they were going to operate our Government, or try to make it operate, like the private industry operates.

Well, I do not know of any private industry that can tell me how much income they are going to have 7 years from now. I do not know of any private industry that itemizes the expenditures that they will make 7 years from now. I do not know of any individual, either in this House or outside this House, who can tell me how much income they will have, CBO numbers or otherwise, 7 years from now.

□ 1915

I do not know of any individual either in this House or outside this House that can itemize for me what expenditures they will make 7 years from now. So we have got this kind of simple-minded ''there is something magic about 7 years'' that my colleagues cannot live up to, and they have boxed themselves in and they are holding the American public hostage to their simple-mindedness.

So I want to call on my colleagues, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, to, please, come to your senses. This makes no sense. Let us open the Government. Let us keep negotiating about these budget issues and get them resolved and do what the American people sent us here to do.

IT IS TIME TO STOP POLITICAL RHETORIC AND ACCEPT COMMON-SENSE REFORM

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in 1993, President Clinton and the Democrat-controlled 103d Congress thought they could reduce or end the Government's deficit by passage of the President's budget bill. That bill dramatically increased taxes on working Americans, but it will not end the deficit or balance the budget.

President Clinton was wrong. He has even admitted publicly he was wrong to have raised taxes. But his actions have not matched his words. President Clinton vetoed the congressionally passed Balanced Budget Act of 1995. The Balanced Budget Act of 1995 would have balanced the Federal budget in 7 years while reducing taxes on working Americans. The bill would have saved Medicare from bankruptcy and preserved this vital health care program for our nation's senior citizens, and the bill would have reformed the welfare system that has created a generation of Americans trapped in poverty and dependent on Government handouts.

President Clinton also vetoed several appropriation bills, including the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce, and others. The President closed the doors of many Federal Agencies and Departments. The President has idled thousands of Federal workers, and the President has inconvenienced millions of Americans who are trying

to secure home mortgage loans, passports, financial aid and other important Government services.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to go beyond just an admission he was wrong. It is time for the President to stop the political rhetoric and accept common sense reform.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that goes like this: ''A wise man will change his mind, but a fool never does.'' In the current debate, it remains to be seen who will or will not change their mind.

The President and the 103d Congress passed a budget bill that raised taxes on working Americans in an effort to lower the deficit and balance the budget. It did not work. That can be seen in the fact that today we are spending $500 million-a-day more than we take in in taxes and revenues. Yet the President has refused to change his mind and consider a new course, a course that will provide a balanced budget by the year 2002.

The President and the 103d Congress initiated the COPS Program. The President's program promised to lower crime rates and make our streets safer by providing Federal funds to State and local governments to hire 100,000 more police officers. Two years later, less than a third of the new police officers promised by the President are on our Nation's streets, and when the Federal funds run out, the State and local governments will have to foot the bill for these new officers. The President's plan is costly. It is another unfunded Federal mandate forced on the backs of States and local governments. This, too, is clearly a failed policy, and again the President has refused to change his mind and consider a new course.

Republicans in the Congress passed an appropriations bill for the Department of Justice. That bill provided some $2 billion in trust fund money for State and local law enforcement block grants. Those funds would have been used to employ additional law enforcement officers; those funds would have provided additional compensation, equipment, or other necessary materials related to basic law enforcement services. Those funds would have enhanced security measures in and around our schools, and those funds would have established multijurisdictional task forces, particularly in rural areas that work with Federal officials for crime prevention and control.

Mr. Speaker, in short, that bill would have done what the President's bill failed to do. The bill would have returned money and decisionmaking to local police departments. The bill would have allowed them to make decisions on how to reduce crime in their communities, but again the President has refused to change his mind over a failed policy. He vetoed that bill.

There is another old saying that you can fool some of the people some of the time but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

The American people are not fooled by the press conferences and political rhetoric being put forth by the President. Every day that this impasse continues, the public becomes more angry at the President and the Congress.

In December, the public was leaning towards placing blame at the feet of Congress. Now, however, the American people are dividing the blame between the President and the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, often political leaders will govern by poll numbers. The President peaked and missed his highwater mark in the polls by 3 days. With the President's failure to agree on a balanced budget concept that we as a Congress could have voted on this past Wednesday, it is now apparent to the public that the President is not sincere about balancing the budget.

This is not a situation where the President is winning or losing some political game. There are no points to be scored here. From now on, everybody loses.

Mr. Speaker, I say again, it is time for the President to stop the political rhetoric and accept commonsense reform.

THE EFFECTS OF FURLOUGHING GOVERNMENT WORKERS

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, when my Republican colleagues took over the majority of this Chamber, they declared that they were going to run Congress like a business. Now, let us just think about that for a second. If we had a business where the CEO of that business and the board of directors had a disagreement and then what they decided to do was to furlough the workers and pay them, all right, think about that.

There is no business in this country where there would be a disagreement between the CEO and the board of directors and they would furlough the workers and then pay them. And if you think about this for a second, if it was a publicly traded company and they decided to do that, what would happen in the market the next day? The value of that company would be destroyed.

Well, that is where we are right now. That is what has happened, and what has happened is totally indefensible.

I spent almost 3 hours on the floor yesterday evening, really involved in a dialog and debate with my Republican colleagues, and after 3 hours I still did not get an articulate answer, because there really is not. I mean, it is as crazy as it seems to people out there in America. It is as whacked out as it seems. There is no explanation. They can try to come up with an explanation. There is no explanation, except for irresponsibility, for what is going on. And we are starting to see real people and real just outrage at some of the things.

I just got a fax from a constituent, Gregory Inch, from Hollywood, FL, and I will read part of it or just summarize part of the letter. He is a double amputee, a veteran. Let me read a little:

> In February of 1994, I was involved in an accident that resulted in amputation of both my legs above the knee. It took me and my family some time to get through the initial shock. One year later, after a lot of soul-searching, I got in touch with an organization that enabled me to attend college, the department of vocational rehabilitation. This organization helped me get back on my feet. I started Broward Community College with hopes of receiving a preengineering degree so I could transfer to Florida International University and receive my BA. On January 3, 1996, I went through the normal channels in order to continue my education, only to be informed that the Government shutdown caused the funding of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation to stop, a shock to me and my family that almost equaled my disabling accident. Especially shocked was my wife, who has been working two jobs to pay necessary household bills while still in college. I am a registered Republican, age 27, married, a veteran, one child, who is having second thoughts on the way the government is handling the responsibility to society at large.

I could not say it better than he did.

Let me also mention another thing, a fax I got in today from my district also. I have two ports in my district. The Consumer Product Safety Commission employees who are at those ports to basically do inspections are not there, so when crayons are coming in from China into Port Everglades in Broward County or Port Miami in Miami are not inspected, the lead content is coming in without inspection. We are going to read about the disasters that occur at a future time.

I got a call today from the warden of a Federal correctional institution in my district, and the workers, the prison guards at that facility, are working, about 300 guards at that prison. They are working but not getting paid, and you can imagine the morale situation in a prison, a correctional institution where the guards are not getting paid, but in fact the prisoners are because the prison work program is getting paid. It is an unstable equilibrium.

Twenty thousand visas are given to come to the United States a day in our foreign embassies. They have not been given out for the last 20 days; 400,000 visas.

Now, I am glad that my colleague from Florida is standing because it affects his district as much as it affects mine. We have the good fortune of living in south Florida, where people from around the country and around the world visit. Every one of those people who is not getting a visa is dollars lost to our communities. The actual out-of-pocket payment that we are losing is over $40 million a day of taxpayers' money of out-of-pocket costs for taxpayers of this country. Over the 20-day period, close to a billion dollars has been lost by taxpayers in this country.

In the previous shutdown, about $750 million of outright waste, garbage, a multiplier effect of 4 or 5 times that effect has cost our economy. It really is

time for us to act like adults. Adults can disagree on issues and yet they can still have discussions.

I hope my Republican colleagues join what everyone in this country out there in America wants us to do, which is to pass a CR and get the Government moving again.

REOPENING THE GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to get this Government back working. You know, we have a lot of debate and a lot of rhetoric up here about a balanced budget. Yes, that, indeed, is one of my most important goals as a Member of the 104th Congress, to get a balanced budget, but I do not take any pride in doing it when we are talking about workers who work for this Government, who come to work to serve our veterans, who come to work to serve every average American in this country, and some Members of Congress act as if their jobs do not matter, as if they should not be paid, and we will keep this thing shut down until we get the President to blink.

Ladies and gentlemen, we know the President has had a chance to produce a budget for us that shows deficits from 1996 of $196 to $209 billion in the year 2005. That is Congressional Budget Office numbers that suggest we will never get to under the prior 10-year budget plan for deficit reduction during the Clinton presidency or anyone who follows.

The bottom line is: Why are we holding employees hostage of Government? There are people that have mortgage payments to pay, there are people that have to feet their families. So I think it is appropriate that, as we are standing on this floor tonight, Members of the Republican Conference are coming up with a strategy hopefully to reopen and put those people back to work.

I have a veterans' hospital in my location, and that veterans' hospital has people that have served this Nation in times of peace and in times of war that are desperately needing medical attention. Those very fine people that work at that facility deserve pay.

But the overriding, most important issue that remains with this Member of Congress is that the President does genuinely come forward with a proposal to balance the budget. We can disagree on spending. I am for getting rid of the B–2 bomber. I am for doing some things differently in this Congress and not spending money on pork and waste. I will put more money to Medicare to help our senior citizens.

But we have got to develop a strategy that balances the budget, and we cannot talk in fiction and we have got to deal with reality.

□ 1930

Let me just read a couple of letters I have got from people around the country.

James Lister, from Simpsonville, SC, writes:

DEAR MR. FOLEY, It is amazing what a few courageous men and women with a dedicated leader can accomplish. There are literally millions and millions of Americans who are standing with you and what you are doing to cut the size of government and bring the spending down.

The media is pouring on its worst. We know it is because you are effective.

For our sake, don't stop talking, don't cave in and don't let up the pressure on for a real balanced budget.

Our warmest wishes for you and your family for a joyous Christmas and a prosperous New Year!

Margaret Hurt, from California, writes:

The freshman class are the best thing that has come to D.C. in a long time.

With you guys and Newt and Rush Limbaugh I feel that the good old U.S.A. is getting a real break.

Hang in there. With your enthusiasm and diligence coupled with an openness to the truth, we are going to be all right!

I watched you tonight in C–SPAN, Dec. 19, and just love all of you. Keep in touch with the ''people''! We love it!

Tell Newt we love him, and pass the card around, please.

Donald Boelter; from Burbank, CA, writes:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOLEY: It was very encouraging to watch on C–SPAN the group of Freshmen express their views on how best to bring government back to the people.

To once again give the people the right to decide how their money is spent, how their lives will be regulated and the return of responsibility into their lives.

As a young 71 year old, I saw in the gathered faces the same eagerness and resolve to face the problems that confront America today as in the resolve of American troops during the days of Bastogne.

Your's is no less a battle. Ever greater than that of 51 years ago and consequences to our beloved Nation immense.

On this Christmas eve I give thanks for all of the Freshman class and their efforts to bring back common sense to our Government.

God Bless You and Yours.

Rick Schendel, from Michigan writes:

MR. MARK FOLEY, I am a voter from Macomb county in southeast Michigan and I writing to thank you for keeping up the fight for fiscal responsibility. Unfortunately my Representative is Minority Whip and the chances of him being in favor of a balanced budget are nil. This letter might not mean much but I thought you should know than there are a lot of people out here that agree with your ideas. No one wants to hurt the elderly or throw people out on the streets, but a seven year plan to balance the budget should be relatively easy and painless to achieve. We are counting on you and your colleagues to take charge of this fight. Get us a good, fair plan with teeth in it so three or four years from now we aren't faced with another budget crisis. Again, I would like to thank you for your efforts on behalf of our generation and future generations. Keep up the good work.

Those are letters from around the country. Let me read to you one thing, ''Ten Cannots,'' originally attributed to Lincoln but which were done by Rev. William Boetcker, a Presbyterian minister.

You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.

You cannot help small men by tearing down big men.

You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.

You cannot lift the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.

You cannot help the poor man by destroying the rich.

You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than your income.

You cannot further the brotherhood of man by inciting class hatred.

You cannot establish security on borrowed money.

You cannot build character and courage by taking away men's initiative and independence.

You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

EXTREMISTS ARE DRIVING THE AGENDA IN THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have a chart over here dated December 29, 1995, ''Pay to the Order of Federal Employee.'' A Federal employee in my district who works at the Bronx Veterans Administration Medical Center in my district received a paycheck for $1.51 for her 40 hours of work. $1.51. All the deductions were taken out, but her full salary was not there because of the Government shutdown.

Let me tell you what $1.51 can buy you in New York City, in Bronx, New York, where I live. It can buy you a subway token. That costs $1.50. That can get you to work, and then you have a whole penny left over to spend as you see fit. This is the result of the House Republican Government shutdown. It is signed ''U.S. House of Representatives Extremists,'' because that is what is happening. Extremists are driving the agenda. And it is for ''Don't spend it all in one place.''

What is happening in our country today, Mr. Speaker, is a disgrace and a sham. Make no mistake about it. The Republicans have shut the Government down. The House Republicans have shut the Government down. The House Republican leadership has shut the Government down by not permitting a vote on this floor to open the Government.

We tried yesterday. We could not get it on the floor, and we were ruled out of order. So if we are so concerned about the veterans and we are so concerned about the seniors and we are so concerned about the American public that is not getting its benefits, we have the ability to open the Government by passing a clean continuing resolution. That is what are have to do. They did it in the other House. Both Republicans and Democrats did it in the

other House. But the House Republicans here will not allow it to come to the floor.

That would open the Government immediately. This is what has always been done in the past when there has been a dispute between the President and the Congress. Both Houses pass a continuing resolution to keep the Government open while negotiations are going on. It has always been done.

We have had a series of Republican Presidents and Democratic Congresses. This has never been done for so long a period of time, because a continuing resolution was passed. This is part of a calculated strategy to try to bring the President to his knees and to bring the country to its knees so that they can push through their radical, extreme agenda.

What is this radical, extreme agenda? It is slashing Medicaid, slashing Medicare, harming the environment, slashing education, all to give a tax break for the rich. That to me is a disgrace. A tax break for the rich, but let us hurt the senior citizens of this country. Let us hurt the children of this country. Let us hurt our environment, and let us add taxes on working families to give a tax break to the rich.

That is the extreme Republican agenda. A colleague before said there is a saying, ''You can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time.'' Well, in the last election, some of the people were fooled some of the time, but when they voted for Republicans they did not know they were voting for this extreme agenda.

The Contract for America did not say hurt senior citizens by cutting their Medicare and cutting their Medicaid and hurting our kids by cutting education and killing the environment. It did not say that. But the hand has been played, and the extreme agenda is here.

Make no mistake about it, we could reopen the Government tomorrow and the American people would not suffer, if the Republicans in this House who are in the majority would vote to reopen the Government, would vote for a continuing resolution.

Now, the reason we need this continuing resolution is because they did not do their job to begin with. They did not pass the budget bills and send them to the President on time. That is why the Government has been shut down. They say well, you know, the President vetoed some of these bills. It is his prerogative as the Chief Executive to veto the bills. This is the way the Constitution says things are supposed to happen. This has always happened in this country. The President vetoes, we come back and try to override the veto or we pass another bill.

But this is part of a calculated plan to push forward an extreme agenda, and it will not work. One has nothing to do with the other. The balanced budget has nothing to do with this Government shutdown. It is two separate issues which the Republicans are linking.

So make no mistake about it, this is not about a balanced budget. This is about shutting the Government down.

I say to my Republican colleagues, please join us in voting for a clean continuing resolution to open the Government once again while negotiations are going on. The only people who are suffering are the American people, and they ought not to suffer anymore.

PRESIDENT RESPONSIBLE FOR GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address my colleagues tonight on some important issues. First, I would want to take a moment if I could in looking at the perspective of where we are today.

Mr. Speaker, we have to remember on November 20 the President of the United States signed into law legislation which said that he, along with Congress, would in fact balance the budget. Unfortunately, as part of that law, he said that he would in fact do this by the end of the year. Of course, now we are into the new year; the budget has not been balanced.

The President of the United States said during his campaign three major things: I want to change welfare as we know it; I want to balance the budget; and I want tax reform for the middle class.

This House, in a bipartisan fashion, has passed such legislation. It is the President, not the Congress, that has forced the furlough of workers. In fact, the President has in fact not signed into law appropriation bills, 13 of which he received from the House; and when the balanced budget came up, it passed by 351 to 40. The President's budget, which did not balance and in fact was $265 billion out of budget, in fact that was defeated by a bipartisan 425 to 0.

So I say to the President, we certainly want to have a balanced budget and also to have the workers go back, and we will work with you to make that accomplished in a bipartisan fashion, as this Congress has worked all year.

TRIBUTE TO CLARE LINDGREN WOFFORD, A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I want to take a moment for a special person in my district, Clare Lindgren Wofford, who was the wife of our former U.S. Senator, Harris Wofford, from Pennsylvania. Her untimely death occurred today.

She was a great American, a loving wife to former Senator Harris Wofford, dedicated to her husband and family. She was a leader in college education, not only in Pennsylvania but across the country; an outstanding intellect, a noted author. Clare Lindgren Wofford was assistant to the president for development at the American College in Bryn Mawr, PA; Director for the Centennial Campaign at Bryn Mawr College. She worked with her husband in partnership for education, to make sure our country was stronger and higher education was supported.

She was also Director of the Katherine Gibbs School in Philadelphia, and Director of International Seminars at the University of Pennsylvania, working in seminars for business executives, where programs involved the Japanese economy, the Chinese economy, and American business. Moreover, she was reaching out to students in internship programs and business.

Clare Lindgren Wofford was as well a former director of the Washington Council of the African-American Institute and previously a political analyst with the U.S. Department of State, and a national champion in original oratory and debate.

She is someone who has also been vice president of the Philadelphia Area Committee for UNICEF, on the board of directors on the World Affairs Council in Philadelphia, and a member of the board of trustees of Temple University in Philadelphia.

Today, we in Pennsylvania and in my district mourn Clare Lindgren Wofford as someone who is a leader in higher education and, along with the American College, the Bryn Mawr College and the residents of our district and in Pennsylvania generally, we mourn the loss of a great friend.

The most fitting tribute, Mr. Speaker, I think to the life of Clare Lindgren Wofford would be to continue to support higher education and the programs she supported, and that would be a fitting living memorial for what contributions she has made to the country.

DEDICATED FEDERAL WORKERS BEING TREATED UNFAIRLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BARCIA] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, the people who are being treated most unfairly in this ridiculous shutdown of Federal agencies are the dedicated workers who are showing up for work day after day without any idea of when they are getting paid.

And to make matters even worse, some of these workers stand to lose well-earned benefits because of the shutdown.

I know that people who work for the Justice Department, including members of the U.S. Marshall's office and the FBI, are at risk of losing earned vacation time. Like other Federal employees, they face a use-it-or-lose-it situation when their accumulated leave exceeds 240 hours per year.

Under current procedures, these employees will lose their excess hours if they are not used by the end of the current pay period. But these people have

been deemed essential as a result of the shutdown of the Justice Department and have been prohibited from using their accumulate leave time.

While it is true that there are procedures in place for these dedicated Federal servants to apply for extra time to use this excess leave because of extraordinary circumstances, why should these individuals be compelled to make extra effort to keep the benefits they have earned and are being prohibited from using?

I firmly believe that in any future legislation to restore benefits to Federal employees affected by the shutdown, that an automatic extension for the use of this excess leave time should be included. We should not make these Justice Department workers or any similarly affected Federal employees fight to keep what they have earned, and what the budget impasse prevents them from using.

CONGRESS TO BLAME FOR FEDERAL SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if we do nothing else, it is our constitutional duty as Members of the U.S. Congress to pass the appropriation bills. Yet it is January 4, and we have only passed 7 of the 13 appropriation bills that are necessary to fund the Federal Government. No one is to blame except Congress; to exact, the extreme Republican Members of the House.

It is hard to me to believe that Republicans want to recess until January 23. If you ask my opinion, they have been in recess since the beginning of the 104th Congress, because in the Constitution we must pass the appropriation bills, and not in the Republicans' contract.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very brief, because I do not want to interrupt the gentlewoman's remarks. But our Republican colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX], who was here earlier, talked about a November 19 agreement, a continuing resolution that was in fact signed by the President and by the Speaker of the House. There were two parties to the agreement.

□ 1945

And the issue was to talk about a balanced budget in 7 years; but, also, part of that agreement was to reinforce the priorities and values of this Nation that include Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, and tax reform for working middle-class families.

I dare say that the President has kept his part of the bargain. It is our Republican colleagues and Republican leadership in this House who have failed to move on any reduction in their cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, education, or the environment, or to remove their tax break package, which is $245 billion, to the wealthiest Americans.

When we talk about that agreement, we need to talk about both sides who signed and discussed that agreement. And I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentlewoman one question. Will you clear up for the American people the question as far as the balanced budget? They keep talking about the balanced budget. Yes; we want to balance the budget, but it is a question of priorities, shared sacrifices. What are some of the other factors?

Ms. DELAURO. Well, the issue is, and my colleague is right, there is not a Member of this House who does not want to see the Congress, House and the Senate, and the President put our fiscal house in order. Everyone wants to move in that direction. The question is, as you pointed out so well, the priorities in dealing with this budget, how one gets to a balanced budget.

Now, if we want to talk about $245 billion in a tax break for the wealthiest Americans, provide them with that, and at the same time we want to cut $270 billion in Medicare, we want to cut $163 billion in Medicaid, we want to cut education programs, and the environment, and increase taxes for working middle-class families, then our priorities are wrong in terms of balancing that budget. Take that tax break package off of the table and then let us talk about balancing the budget.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentlewoman would stay with me, I would ask her, does she think this sounds a little like voodoo economics again?

Ms. DELAURO. It is really a shell game and politics at its worst in this body. The linking of the shutdown of the Government to the balanced budget, as I said, is the worst of politics because we cannot continue the budget negotiations or talk about what the American public wants to talk about in terms of Medicare and Medicaid.

We do not have to keep this Government shut down. This is holding the American public hostage and workers hostage, and it is wrong, and I believe that the public is beginning to understand what is going on. The American public said to the President of the United States, veto this budget that cuts Medicare, Medicaid, and pays for a tax break for the wealthy. Sixty percent encouraged the President to veto this budget.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Well, I have heard three times today that you can fool some of the people some of the time. The American people need to let the Republicans know that they are not being fooled by this talk about balancing the budget while we do reverse Robin Hood, where we are robbing from the working people and poor people to give a tax break to people who do not need it, do not want it, and do not deserve it.

Ms. DELAURO. The gentlewoman from Florida is absolutely right. I applaud the work she has done on the floor of this House in order to try to bring out precisely what is going on here. Sometimes it is difficult to get the word out and to really have people understand what kind of a shell game is being played on them.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman.

PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS SHRUNK GOVERNMENT AND REDUCED THE DEFICIT

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we are in a bad situation. We are in a situation that the majority leader of the U.S. Senate, a Republican, I am a Democrat, said I do not see any sense in what we have been doing. That is the Republican leader who said I do not see any sense in what we have been doing.

We are in a bad state. I am a supporter of the constitutional amendment to balance the budget. I was a supporter of the 7-year CBO-scored real balanced budget known as the coalition budget. I believe that we ought to have a balanced budget by the year 2002.

Why are we here? I came to Congress in 1981, and that is when it started, frankly. Under Ronald Reagan. Ronald Reagan had a Democratic House and a Republican Senate for three-quarters of his term, 6 years out of the 8, and during that period of time he quadrupled the national debt. Why do I say he did it? Well, we both did it, the Congress did it and the President did it.

In point of fact, Ronald Reagan asked for more spending than the Congress gave him. Hear that. Ronald Reagan asked for more spending than the Congress gave him. And, in fact, when he submitted his budgets, he built in large deficits. He projected them. George Bush did the same thing. So, collectively, we ran up a debt of over $4 trillion, now about $4.8 trillion.

Now, that is a serious matter, which is why I am for an amendment and why I want to see us balance the budget. But contrary to those who would say it is a crisis requiring the most drastic unsensible steps, this country has been in debt far above what we are in debt now, just after the Second World War, as it relates to our gross domestic product. That is the money we have to pay the debt.

This President, President Bill Clinton, took office and knew we had a problem. He put a bill on this floor in 1993, a tough bill, and for the first time since 1948, that economic program resulted in reducing the deficit each year in the 3 years that President Clinton has been President, unlike Ronald Reagan and unlike George Bush. The

deficit has fallen during each of those years, from $290 billion, when he took over, to $255 billion, then to $203 billion, and now to $164 billion.

What is my point? My point is, we have not gotten there yet, but, boy, are we going in the right direction. That deficit is going down. So this is not a crisis where we see that we are out of control and we have not addressed the problem. Do we need to do more? Yes, we do and I am supporting that we do more.

The fact of the matter is some said we had to get Government under control and shrink its size. President Bill Clinton proposed that we do just that. In 3 years we have reduced the Federal level of employment by 185,000 people, smaller than under either President Reagan or President Bush.

We are going in the right direction. But in 1994, we had some revolutionaries win an election. What do revolutionaries want to do? They want to overthrow governments. In fact, Speaker GINGRICH said in June he was going to close down, shut down the Government, and that, in fact, is what he has done.

BOB DOLE said I do not see any sense in what we have been doing. Amen. BOB DOLE was right. So he passed a CR over to us, unanimously. Not partisan bickering or rancoring. They knew closing down the Government to accomplish a balanced budget did not make any sense. Why? Because they are not related. In fact, shutting down the Government exacerbates, makes worse, the debt.

LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL RISKING THEIR LIVES WITHOUT BEING PAID

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

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, it is very rare that I get on the floor to address an issue, but tonight I felt that it was important for me to do such a thing for two reasons.

I found out this afternoon that along the Mexican border, the Arizona border, that we have Border Patrol agents and other law enforcement personnel who are out there enforcing the laws of this country and they are doing it and will do it without pay.

There is a case in which it is a couple, man and wife, with children, who are employees of the Border Patrol out there on the desert, protecting this country from criminal activities, apprehending people who went across the border illegally, and yet this couple finds themselves today and tomorrow that they may not have the money to pay their mortgage or to pay their bills.

At the veterans hospital in Phoenix, AZ, we have employees going to food banks in order that they can feed their children and their families. I agree, and very rarely do I agree with BOB DOLE, but enough is enough.

As the previous speaker told us, the plan to hold the Government hostage, I think, is now reversing itself and it is causing the Republican majority, who has the obligation to govern, to now scramble and pass a CR that will pay for minimum services of the Federal Government.

And the rallying cry is going to be that we cannot trust the President of the United States, President Clinton. The Republicans are going to say that he is not negotiating in good faith. He vetoed a budget that was given to him, that was passed by this House and the Senate, and he said why he vetoed it. He did not want to give a big tax break on the backs of children, students, elderly, et cetera. And for the past 40 hours, he has been and his aides have been in serious negotiation with the leadership of the Senate and the House. He will continue to do that.

What has happened is that the Republicans have held Government employees, the U.S. Government, as hostage in trying to get the President to agree to a balanced budget that he has vetoed, and told them why, and he is negotiating in good faith. But because the American people, in loud cries, are saying enough is enough, they are agreeing with the majority leader in the Senate that enough is enough; that tonight, and probably tomorrow morning, there will be resolutions before this House that will try to bring Federal employees in certain areas back to work.

What we should do is pass a clean continuing resolution, bring back the Government employees in order that all Americans get the services they deserve and the President and the leadership of the House and the Senate can continue to negotiate on what should be a proper balanced budget.

Enough is enough. We have people risking their lives enforcing the laws of this country, and yet they are not getting their proper pay and they are endangering their family, not being able to provide for mortgage payments, for food, et cetera. This is being caused by a Republican majority who told us that their main principle, or one of their main principles is upholding family values.

□ 2000

Let us protect these families, and send them back to work.

COMPROMISE AND DISCUSSION WILL LEAD TO BALANCED BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. As I was saying before my time expired, Cynthia Snyder is a Republican. But that is not her major activity. She is a member of the board of directors of United We Stand. United We Stand, of course, is the organization that Ross Perot founded. He raised the budget issue to central concern of this country. I think he performed a service in doing so.

Cynthia Snyder is a concerned citizen in my district. Yes, she is a Republican, and she is with United We Stand. But let me read one paragraph of the letter she sent to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], not to me, but she sent me a copy of it.

She said,

> Why can't Congress get on with their statutory and constitutional mandates to fund the government, instead of holding government employees and the public hostage to their own 7-year budget proposals? Most of us know we must curtail spending and many of us worked hard to elect deficit hawks, but does adding millions per day to the deficit by keeping the government shut down help in any way do that?

She concludes, as I said, by saying,

> Besides, I am a Republican, and you are hurting Republican chances of election to high offices by your amateurish behavior.

BOB DOLE, the majority leader, leading candidate for President of the United States in the Republican Party, said that what we are doing does not make sense. He said as previous speakers said, ''Enough is enough.''

I represent 56,000 Federal employees. They are not responsible for incurring the deficit, and they do not have the power to sit in this body to reduce the deficit. What they try to do is carry out the responsibilities given to them by the executive and legislative branches of Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have held them hostage. We have put families at risk. We have shut down portions of Government, stamped our feet and said, ''Mr. President, if you do not do it our way, we will do it no way.'' Mr. Speaker, that has never before happened in history. Not since 1789 to 1994 has any group with the power to do so, but with the responsibility not to, shut down the Government for 20 days.

Have we had shutdowns before? Yes, but not until 1981, 1982, and then it was for hours, then a half a day, then 1 day over the Columbus Day holiday, the 3-day weekend. But what happened? President Reagan was President and President Bush was President during one or more of those shutdowns. There was a Democratic Congress. When the President would not agree with what we wanted, the Democratic Congress accommodated the President, because that is the constitutional system. If we cannot override a veto, we either need to compromise or not take the action. That is what our Framers contemplated. That is the appropriate way to operate a democracy.

Speaker GINGRICH said earlier this year, ''I will cooperate, but I will not

compromise.'' My friends, in a democracy I do not know how we come together to make policy without compromising. Not compromising our principles, but agreeing that there are different ways to do things, different ways to accomplish objectives, and know that in good faith, Americans acting through their elected representatives could reach those ends. Not stamp their feet. Not point a gun at the President's head and say, If you don't do it my way, I shut down the Government.

BOB DOLE said, ''I don't see any sense in what we've been doing.'' America sees no sense in what we have been doing.

OPEN THE GOVERNMENT AND CONTINUE SERIOUS BUDGET TALKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the previous speaker, my colleague, for saying that this just does not make any sense. I was in my office this evening. I really had not planned to come down, but I was listening to so many of the speakers who kept talking about how they were shutting down the Government and waiting for the President to take action.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the President and the Speaker have been meeting around the clock. I spent a weekend just a couple of weeks ago meeting around the clock trying to work out a balanced budget. I have been in this House now about 7 years, and I have never been part of a time like this. It is really an embarrassment, and I imagine that the people who are watching are embarrassed.

We want to work together in balancing a budget, but I cannot see why closing down the Government, causing such pain to so many people, helps us accomplish that purpose. There are meetings going on.

I have been receiving calls from constituents in my district, and last night the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], my friend, and I were talking about this issue, and I mentioned the fact that at the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Veterans Hospital in Montrose they were having a bake sale in order for the employees who were working there, over 1,400, to get the carfare to go to work. Many of them work from paycheck to paycheck.

Mr. Speaker, the VA Hospital in Montrose is the largest Federal agency in Westchester County. They are deeply affected by this shutdown. The 700 beds in the hospital are full of many elderly patients, including one World War I veteran about to celebrate his 100th birthday.

The hospital also cares for 75,000 veterans on an outpatient basis. Many of these are also elderly. The 1,400 dedicated employees of the Montrose Hospital received 1 week of pay for 2 weeks of work, and they do not know when they are going to get paid for the work that they are doing.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, as we know, many of the employees at the FDR Veterans Hospital are veterans themselves. So, by holding employees hostage, we are penalizing men and women who served our country along with other Federal employees.

This week, in fact, the hospital employees were forced, as I mentioned, to hold the bake sale. In talking to them again this evening, they still do not know how they are going to survive. It is hard to believe the veterans who are working in a veterans hospital have to be subject to such indignities.

They cannot get fare to go to work. They cannot pay for gas or their MetroNorth train passes. And I know it may be very difficult for some of my colleagues to believe this is the case, but it is true. There is also a food drive being started in the local community to help needy employees.

I spoke with Lisa Jackson, a registered nurse. She told us, and the local paper in fact, that so many of the employees are living paycheck to paycheck, and today I also learned that many of the hospital's vendors who are not being paid may soon be forced to stop making deliveries of important supplies. If vendors stop making deliveries to a veterans hospital, they would then have to close down portions of the hospital and some patients would have to be discharged.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to share with you this story, because listening to speaker after speaker so sanctimoniously telling this body that they have to shut down the Government to get their way and balance the budget their way, it does not make any sense. I thought we were all adults. I am a mother of three children, and it sounds to me like children standing in a corner saying, ''I am going to hold my breath and turn blue if I do not get things my way.''

We should be opening the Government. Democrats signed on to a resolution to make it clear that we all support opening the Government now. What we really need is only 20 votes over there on the Republican side to join us so we can open the Government and continue the very serious discussions about balancing the budget.

As we have shared before, this is a battle, this is a serious discussion about the basic priorities of our country. The President has made it clear that he wants to balance the budget in 7 years, protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Now, there are differences of opinion. I understand there are about 80 Republicans that said they will not compromise on a tax cut of $245 billion. Well, I would hope as we conclude, my colleagues, that we can continue to talk, to share our different views, but let us open the Government now and continue serious discussions about balancing the budget.

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 addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. MARTINI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. SCHUMER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. STEARNS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE SITUATION WITH OUR NATION'S BUDGET AND THE NATIONAL DEBT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I have with me the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD]. We are going to talk tonight about the situation with our Nation's budget and our national debt. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is also going to be speaking with me.

I think the first thing that we wanted to do, Mr. Speaker, just to get off the issue of reopening the Government, because that is very important, we are talking real people, real jobs, real mortgages, real paychecks and real grocery bills, and so forth. Speaking for myself, I want to get these folks back to work. So, I am in favor of trying to get the Government up and going again, get these folks back on

the job, and yet at the same time, I do not want to back down from the 7-year balanced budget.

But having said that, I hope I can erase as many of the Democrat comments as possible. Mr. Speaker, I would yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to add my comments on this. As we speak, the Republican conference is meeting for just that purpose, to try to get all the important Federal workers, all the Federal workers back to work, not only for the sake of their families and the good work they are doing, but also because we want to make sure in fact that the services they perform, passports or Social Security or veterans matters or any other agency, gets back to work and takes care of constituents and also takes care of their families.

Mr. Speaker, all we are trying to make sure of on the balanced budget is to make sure the House and Senate wants to have one; the President wants to have one; let us get together on the details and find the common ground. That is what they sent us here to do, not to have gridlock or one side finger-pointing at the other, but actually to make sure that the job is done in a sincere way.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think what is interesting about doing that job is that we not lose sight of the prize, and that prize is actually getting to a balanced budget in 7 years and using real numbers to get there.

Back on Monday, I spent a couple of hours in front of the Kmart in Myrtle Beach talking to folks, and what was interesting about those conversations was that people over and over and over again said, ''Hold the line,'' because if we look at this budget, what we are looking at is $12 trillion. $12 trillion. It is called extreme.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 7 years the Federal Government spent $9.5 trillion. Over the next 7 years what is proposed is spending $12 trillion. Basically, for too long talks in Washington would go along to get along and there were plenty of slaps on the back. And now what we have said in essence is let us hold the line here. This is what we are hearing from folks at home, is that $12 trillion over the next 7 years is enough.

□ 2015

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. What is interesting, if the gentleman would yield, is that fact that we can balance the budget, making sure we provide vital services to our constituents while still maintaining increases for Medicare, increases for Medicaid, increases for education, increases for the environment, and increases for child care. All we want to do is eliminate the waste that has gone on for years in duplicative programs.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, here is a certificate, a Federal Reserve note, that was sent to us, and I believe all Members of Congress, Democrat and Republican, got it from the Old York Foundation. What they said, this was done in the name of the late Seymour Durst. I am not familiar with him, but what he said is this is a $5 trillion note. Every Member of Congress has this $5 trillion note for a $5 trillion debt that we are passing on to our children and our children's children, and we will continue to do so if we do not do anything about it.

What the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SANFORD] says is that 1994 was an election not so much to throw the bums out but an election to stop politics as usual, as you have said. I think it is important for us to think about the size of our national debt and just a couple of numbers that are absolutely terrifying.

This is the number as of November, $4,984,800,213,988.31, and it increases at a rate of $2,207,000 each day, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] says is enough to buy McDonald's Big Mac extra value meals for every person in the United States and in Mexico. He goes on to say that with the annual budget of about $4.6 trillion, we as a government spend $4.4 billion each day, each day that we are here, which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] points out that this is $50,736 each second. That is what the Federal Government spends. These numbers are important because the debate here is about Government spending. That is what we are debating. We are debating the size of government.

Mr. SANFORD. What is interesting, if the gentleman would yield, about that particular number, a carry with me a quote, it is from Sir Alex Francis Taylor, a Scottish historian a little over 100 years ago.

His quote was a democracy cannot exist as a permanent form of government. it only exists until the voters discover that they can vote for themselves largesse from the public treasury. From that moment on the majority usually votes for the candidates promising the most benefits from the public treasury, with the result that a democracy always collapses over loose fiscal policy and is generally followed by a dictatorship. The average age of the world's great civilizations has been 200 years.

These nations have progressed through this sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to great courage, from great courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency, from complacency to apathy, from apathy to dependency and from dependency back again into bondage.

What I think is startling about that is as you look across the time line of history, Rome, it was the largest place in the world at that time, collapsed in 476. The Byzantine Empire came on its heels and yet collapsed in 1453. The Italian Renaissance, as great as it was, came to an end in 1550. The Spanish empire controlled a quarter of the entire known world and yet came to an end around 1588 with the sinking of Spanish Armada.

The point is, you could go through a lot of parallels and in every instance each of those nations, each of those civilizations reached a crossroads in which they had to decide do we stay in this awfully comfortable cycle of upward spending and upward government consumption, or do we go back to what made us a world power in the first place. That is what those numbers I think suggest.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is always far easier to increase spending, add 3 or 4 percent, 10 percentage points each year and just keep on spending. That is why this process this year is so difficult and so long. But generally speaking, we are trying to increase the Federal budget 3 trillion new dollars over the next 7 years, and the President wants to increase it $4 trillion over the next 7 years, so we are debating $3 trillion versus $4 trillion directly in new growth. We are not cutting and we are not freezing the budget.

I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX].

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I appreciate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] taking the time to have this special order because frankly the American public will benefit, I think, from not only having a balanced budget but having the workers return to work and providing the services.

But what the benefits are, that some may not realize, and Alan Greenspan has pointed this out, by being able to have a balanced budget we will be able to reduce the expense of interest, which thereby will reduce the cost for college education, home mortgage, the expense of health care, all of those things that we have as yearly regular expenses. That is going to help working families, help senior citizens, help our children make sure they can have the American dream.

After all, every other government, whether it be State, county or local, has to balance its budget just like families do. What we are trying to do is over a period of time, working with the President, to come to an agreement whereby we can have a balanced budget and everybody has a chance to have the American dream, have their own home, and people will have a job that is of great worth.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman is correct. If we realize the scope of this disaster, of a tremendously expensive debt, and then we look at the benefits of balancing the budget, to give specifics on what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] is saying, that on a 30-year home mortgage the average interest rate will drop 2.7 percent, and on a 30-year mortgage of $50,000 that means a family will save over $1,000 annually or $32,000 over the life of a loan. Car loans will drop 2 percent, which means on a $15,000 car the average family budget would save about $900 during

the life of the loan. Sending children to college, the same thing.

But the other thing, though, that is very important is that businesses will expand, jobs will be created and economic opportunity and prosperity will follow.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield, what is very exciting I think for the American public is, not only will it be new jobs but it will not be Government created jobs. These will be private sector jobs that really will spin out other allied industries, creating more private sector jobs.

Back on education just for a second. I think it is also important to note that this Congress in a bipartisan fashion is moving ahead with additional programs for student loans and grants, such that legislation which many of us have cosponsored would create 100 percent tax credits for employers who provide their employees with college education, and to change the law back so that it is not considered taxable income to the employee who is receiving the educational benefit and hopefully being with a company for some time and bringing that benefit to others.

So we are looking for ways to improve the quality of life, improve education, improve the environment, improve Medicare, improve Medicaid. That can all be accomplished in this budget picture where we have already seen an increase of $71 billion in the areas I have identified.

Mr. KINGSTON. If we have established that it is disastrous to leave the debt out there, we have established there are great benefits to balancing the budget, then what is the problem? Because Speaker after Speaker from both sides of the aisle have come to the well today and said we support a balanced budget and certainly the President does.

Let me read some quotes, though, make sure that we are talking about the same President, June 4, 1992 on Larry King Live, President Clinton speaking: ''I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget.''

Then on his ''Putting People First'' campaign brochure: ''Our plan will cut the deficit in half within 4 years and assure that it continues to fall each year after that.''

May 19, 1995, Bill Clinton, New Hampshire, radio interview: ''I think it can be done. Well, it can, first of all it can be done in 7 years.''

Later on that day, also in New Hampshire: ''I think it can be done in less than 10 years. I think we can get there by a date certain.'' That was in May.

October 1995: ''Well, I think we could reach it in 7 years. I think we could reach it in 8 years. I think we could reach it in 9 years.''

The reason why I say that is not to ridicule the President. Good Lord, everyone in Congress, everyone in America says things and changes his or her mind from time to time. In this case he did it over the same interview, in a 20-minute period, but even then some people are entitled to change their mind.

But here is what George Will said, and this is his column but it was in the Savannah Morning News. It says, ''Clearly the President does not want a balanced budget any more than he wants to end welfare as we know it. So he is vetoing Republican plans that would balance the budget more slowly than he as a candidate promised to.'' Then he goes on to say, ''He said 5 years, they say 7 years, and he probably will, it will depend on who talks to him last, and he'll veto it,'' and he will probably, George Will is saying, he is probably going to veto our welfare reform, which we will talk about welfare reform in a minute, but there is a welfare bill on the President's desk right now and we hopefully will get his signature on it.

But what I wanted to point out is that it is time now to have a balanced budget on the table.

You two are freshmen and you have been called radicals, and yet it is interesting to me that as candidates you had a written outline of a campaign plan, as did President Clinton. As newly elected freshmen, you followed the plan, unlike newly elected President Clinton. And then you did the plan and got criticized for it, and the criticism is coming from people who did not follow their own campaign speeches to balance the budget.

So you have been here a year, you said you were going to do something, you did it, and now you are saying, ''I have done it, now come on, the rest of you all,'' but we are not seeing it.

It is very frustrating to the process. Again, I am not trying to get into this big partisan thing. But it is so hard to negotiate when there is not a counterproposal on the table.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. I would think two thoughts on what the gentleman has just been saying.

One would be, there was a question as to why would the President be doing this. I think it is awfully easy inside the Beltway to lose sight of the decided benefits to balancing the budget.

JACK, I do not know if you saw the article in today's Washington Post, but there was an article talking about, it reads, ''On Balance, Budget Deal Could Offer a $1,000 Bonus,'' and it talks about a study by several economists and it looks at the three benefits that would go with balancing the budget. One would be our children would not have to pay debt in the future because we would have not added another $1 trillion worth of Government spending, the economy would grow more, and we would see lower interest rates.

But here in the Washington Post it is talking about a $1,000 bonus per family for balancing the budget. So I would say that one of the reasons probably the White House has gone back and forth on this number is it is easy to lose sight of those future benefits.

As to your second point about being one of those radical freshman, I think it is awfully interesting to move away from the talk, because there is plenty of talk in Washington, DC, and simply look at the numbers. And how radical is this budget, because what is interesting is if you go from simply the last 7 years, the Federal Government spent $9.5 trillion, and what is proposed in this budget is spending of $12 trillion, which is roughly 2.5 percent annualized growth each year.

For instance, take some of the programs. With Medicaid, we spent $443 billion over the last 7 years, and what is proposed is to spend $791 billion over the next 7 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield on that point because I am glad you brought up some of the specific program differences. Because one of the things that we are not debating here is what are the differences between the Democrats' plan, or lack of plan to some degree, and the Republican plan.

One of the big differences that we hear is that the Republican budget cuts Medicare. As the gentleman just pointed out, and let me get him to repeat those figures.

Mr. SANFORD. On just Medicaid. I will get to Medicare. For instance, with Medicaid we go from spending $443 billion over the last 7 years to spending $791 billion with this proposed budget over the next 7 years. With Medicare we go from spending $926 billion over the last 7 years to a proposal that suggests we spend $1.6 trillion over the next 7 years.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is interesting that the gentleman would bring that up, because here is a December 6, $1 million check and an offer made by the chairman of the Republican National Committee, Haley Barbour. What he said is if any Democrat can prove the rhetoric that Republicans are cutting Medicare, I have got a $1 million check waiting for you one block away from here at the Republican National Committee, just come show us where Medicare is being cut.

Although the rhetoric has not stopped, nobody has collected $1 million.

□ 2030

Just think about it, if you were a Democrat, if you could prove that Medicare was being cut, you would be such a hero and getting the million dollars to boot, but nobody has come to claim that check, which is almost a month old now.

Mr. SANFORD. I know my colleague from Georgia knows these numbers better than I do. When you actually look at the Medicare on a per capita basis, look at how we go from spending $4,800 per beneficiary to moving up basically at 7 percent a year to $7,100 a year in 2002, it is remarkable to see that kind of yearly growth.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Would the gentleman kindly yield for a moment? I certainly will not take advantage of the length of time that you have, but

you did indicate that nobody has claimed it. I will be happy to try and claim the money as far as the Medicare is concerned.

But I do not want to engage in the kind of verbal jousting that I think has characterized some of the debate.

Mr. KINGSTON. If I could reclaim, and I will yield back to you, I am glad to hear that because, you know, so much of the jousting, and both sides can admit some guilt here, is totally based on fantasy and what sounds good on a 30-second sound bite rather than what is real.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I quite agree. So my question is a serious one on that leading to the other question about balanced budget, which I am also serious about.

I think the reason that the argument starts over Mr. Barbour's offer and then goes off into the ethereal on Medicare is that the argument is not about whether or not there is increased amount of money in the Republican proposal or in Mr. Clinton's original proposals, for that matter, but whether or not, given the expansion of the base population that will be in need of Medicare and Medicaid, whether that will be sufficient to cover the basic needs regardless of how much you are able to rein in the overall expenditures on hospitals, nursing homes, pharmaceutical needs, et cetera. That then becomes, if you will, just allow me another 10 or 15 seconds, that then becomes an argument over different economists making projections as to what the need will be vis-a-vis the population of the United States, the aging population of the United States, the requirement in social security benefits as the baby boomers come in and the number of people contributing to it goes down, et cetera, those kinds of things. That gets into the realm of sheer speculation.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time a second, that is a good point, and that is why our budget goes from $4,800 to $7,100 per person with anticipation of the population increase, $4,800 to $7,100, which again is not a cut.

Now, one of the questions is, OK, is that enough? Let me finish now. Is that enough? Well, I can say this, if we do not act to reform, preserve and protect Medicare, the April 3 trustees report has already told us it is going bankrupt. So while we cannot tell you with absolute certainty that going from $4,800 to $7,100 is going to be perfect, we can tell you with certainty based on the trustees report of April 3, 1995, that Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If you will be so kind, then why would we want to take any money out of that fund? Why would you not want to, if you are increasing the money from $4,800 to $7,100, I will not dispute that, that there is an increase in that number? I would argue that I do not believe that is going to be enough, based on our experience in Hawaii, and so on. That is my view and some others. I mean, economists have a job explaining to other people why they do not have jobs. Right. So one economist will tell you one thing, and, you know, we are victims of that as much as we are beneficiaries.

So why would you want to take any money out of Medicare at this time, $270 billion, $240 billion, whatever it is? Why would we want to take money out?

To the degree we want to count savings as a result of tightening up waste, fraud, and abuse, tightening up the amount that we are willing to pay for hospital care or doctor's fees or pharmaceutical needs, et cetera, to the degree there is a savings, let us suppose, again for honest conversation sake, that the $270 billion that is proposed for savings is actually savings, would we not want to have that savings reinvested in the system? Are you counting the $270 billion toward the $7,100?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman from South Carolina wants time, just speak up.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I will not take much longer. This is your time.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think these are very good questions and they are valid. As you know, Medicare inflation has been 11 percent a year. Regular medical inflation is between the 4- and 6-percent range.

What our plan does is try to slow down that increase of inflation and growth or growth due to inflation each year and get it down in the 6- to 7-percent range, which the gentleman knows is what Mrs. Clinton called for in 1993.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Which we have already achieved in Hawaii.

Mr. SANFORD. If the gentleman will yield, I think what is interesting about the numbers, and I mean you are looking at a 49-percent increase over 7 years, you are looking at an increase two times the rate of inflation, but you are touching one of the holy grails in politics, and I think the significance of that is that typically the way that Washington has been hear no evil, see no evil, speak no evil, as it relates to anything that might be at all controversial, and clearly Medicare is; but you have got a trustees' report that says if you do not do something you guys are going to have a real problem, that it will go bankrupt, period.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Then, excuse me, why would you not then want to take the $270 billion out of it? Why not apply it toward the $7,100?

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, let me make correct the terminology to the degree that we are not taking money out of that. What that $270 billion figure represents is the projected growth at the 11-percent inflation rate range, and for us to have private sector inflation rate in the 4-percent range and public Federal health care and Medicare at 11-percent range is totally inefficient. What we want to do, as a way to reduce that growth rate, is to increase the competition and replace that 1964 model with a 1995 model which will save and protect and preserve Medicare.

Mr. SANFORD. If I might interject just prior, I think the significance of that, though, is that you look at, I mean, Medicare right now is the equivalent of the only gas station stop on a very long and lonely stretch of interstate, and what is being proposed with this Republican plan is basically rather than that one gas station where, sure enough, you can count on getting gas but you may not get the lower price or best service, is having six or seven little gas stations so you begin to have competition, which begins the working of the marketplace which directly affects price.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I appreciate you yielding the final time. I think you would be able to make, not you personally, but we would be able to make this argument back and forth in a way that could resolve this issue a lot better, then, and I think would be understood more easily and accepted, perhaps more importantly, by the American people as a whole, than if we kept that argument within the Medicare-Medicaid-Social Security syndrome and got rid of the tax cuts. I think if people were not making the association between cuts and/or additions arguments that are made in Medicare and Medicaid, in the context of a tax cut, if we could remove that tax cut from the context, I think that this argument would reach a different level of not only civility but of understandability and perhaps even acceptability within the country.

Mr. KINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I would be quick to say, unfortunately, it is Members of your party who have linked the two even in the face of their own trustees saying that Medicare is going bankrupt in 7 years.

You know what, I was reading an article about President Clinton, who has not had an agenda this year, has finally found a cause to be, and that is the agenda of fear on the old folks, saying that Republicans are going to do all kinds of things to the elderly, as if we do not have parents, as if we do not have grandparents. And so I am glad that the gentleman is forthcoming, and I will say this, that I was asked by a reporter the other day, ''Well, isn't the balanced budget going to be an election issue if you do not solve something?'' And I said it is going to be an election issue whatever happens. And it was in 1994, it was in 1992, it was in 1990, and it will continue to be, as will all Federal Government spending.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I am very grateful for your yielding the time. I hope at some point when I am discussing the balanced budget issue, perhaps you could be on the floor, and perhaps I could yield time to you so we might further the discussion.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am always happy to yield time to the distinguished weightlifting gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Many thanks. I send you my aloha.

Mr. KINGSTON. We wanted to touch base also on this tax issue because I think that it is important to talk about it because we have heard so many times that it is a tax break for the rich.

Now, President Clinton said as much as President Clinton says anything that he supports a capital gains tax cut. Then, of course, he immediately said a disclaimer, saying, ''I am not sure how much or when,'' or whatever kind of Clintonesque comments he would qualify something with.

But let us assume that the capital gains tax cut is OK. So what do we have now that we are giving to the middle-class taxpayers that has horrified so many of the folks on the other side of the aisle that is a tax break for the rich?

This is it, a $500-per-child tax credit. Now, who is going to get the benefit of that? Eighty-nine percent of the people who get benefit of that have a family household income of $75,000 or less.

Now, look at this, 4 percent of the people who benefit from that have an income of over $100,000. Now, there are Members of this body who like socialists more than they like successful people who have earned and lived the American dream, and I think that is too bad. We need to have successful people in our country, and we cannot constantly use them as a whipping post for all of our frustrations because maybe not everyone knows how to make that money. So 4 percent of the people who are going to get a $500-per-child tax break have an income of over $100,000, and I believe we have capped it anyhow at $110,000 down the road.

But, you know, what I am saying, that 89 percent of the people who are going to benefit have a household income of $75,000 or less. Does that sound l ike a tax break for the wealthy?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. It does not. Further, what made the middle-class tax reform such a viable proposal, which had bipartisan support in the House and the Senate, is that it also had some other significant items that helped other individuals across the board, an adoption tax credit of $5,000 to help families adopt children. It also called for a seniors' earning limit increase. Right now seniors under 70 cannot make more than $11,280 without deductions from Social Security. Our proposal would take it up to $30,000 a year.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me interrupt you one minute. As I recall, President Clinton increased taxes on Social Security in 1993.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. What you are saying is we are repealing the Clinton Social Security tax increase.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. And as well allowing the seniors to earn more than $11,280 a year without having a bite out of social security, both.

Mr. KINGSTON. I guess since the Democrats voted for that social security tax increase, that is why they do not want to vote to repeal it?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Obviously, I could not explain that to you as to reasons of other persons. I think the proposal has a lot of merit. It also called for elder care tax cut, two new IRA's for individuals and couples, and I think, frankly, with the infusion of the capital gains tax reduction for individuals and businesses, what we are going to have here is growth of businesses, growth of savings, and growth of jobs, all of which are pro-economy, and pro-people, and so it is the populist idea that has been embraced by Republicans and Democrats alike as well as those who are financial experts on Wall Street and on Main Street.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think one thing that is interesting, as we talk taxes, two things about the administration, first, as a candidate the President promised a middle-class tax cut. That was part of his platform. That was one of the main planks of his platform as a candidate in 1992. Speaking in Houston, TX, October 17, the President said, ''Many people are still mad about the 1993 budget,'' and they think he raised taxes too much. Now I quote, ''It might surprise you to know that I think I raised them too much, too,'' the President said.

So, you know, here we have a candidate who said he was going to give a middle-class tax cut; then we have a President who 2 months ago said, ''I think that I raised taxes too much.''

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. That is what gives me hope that we are going to come to a settlement here. We are going to get a balanced budget. We are going to make sure programs like Medicare, Medicaid, the environment, children's programs, education, will, in fact, be there for all Americans, but not with the waste we have had over the last 20–30 years, with the unbridled spending which duplicates much of what is happening in our local districts, and none of the waste that has come from having bureaucracies upon bureaucracies to the extent that we are definitely spending too much.

□ 2045

Mr. KINGSTON. I want to talk about some of the unbridled spending after the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Just on the subject of taxes, I hear it a lot at home. You are talking about Main Street. What is interesting is to think the National Taxpayers Union estimates that all of us spend basically the first 6 months of each year working to pay for the total cost of Federal, State, and local governments. If you actually break that down on a daily basis, it means that everybody goes to work in the morning, they spend the entire morning working for somebody else, they break for lunch, and then they get to spend the afternoon working for themselves and their families. What I am hearing from folks is that does not make common sense.

What I think to be even worse, you look at how that is going to impact children. It takes every single Federal income tax filed west of the Mississippi simply to pay the interest on the national debt. And if that was not bad enough, what is worse is how it looks for our children.

A child born in America today will pay $187,000 in taxes to pay for their share of interest on the national debt. Viewed another way, generational accounting says to keep our Government solvent, they would have to pay an 82-percent tax rate if we stayed on the course we are on. So I think when we talk about these tax rates, they are fairly alarming numbers that I think impact everybody's lives.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think it is important also to point out that in our budget process, not only do we repeal that 1993 tax increase on Social Security, but we also increase the earnings limitation. As the gentleman knows, senior citizens are only allowed to make a certain amount of money at the age of 62. This increases that threshold from $11,000 to $30,000 over a 7-year period of time so seniors can remain working, productive, and not be penalized on their Social Security that is also in the budget.

We mentioned spending. I wanted to make this point on spending. One of the programs that the President has said he is prepared to go to the mat for is his AmeriCorps Program. I know there are a lot of good things that happen through AmeriCorps. But here is a Savannah Morning News article, an editorial, about the volunteers. It says that the volunteers working for AmeriCorps are making approximately $18 an hour. It says that the program is already bigger than Peace Corps ever was, just in its first year of operation. It has become a costly Great Society program that relies too much on government and not enough on society to solve its own problems.

The General Accounting Office, which is nonpartisan, reports that the average participant in AmeriCorps is supported by $25,000 in Federal, State and local taxes. That is more than private sector jobs.

It talks about some of the good things that they do, feeding the hungry, helping the elderly and so forth. And then this article says but those AmeriCorps volunteers are paid only about $9,000 for their $1,700 of community work, with approximately $1,500 of that going to college expenses. The rest of the $25,000 goes to the bureaucracy.

This is the President's idea of efficient and effective spending? Going to the volunteer himself is $7,500, and the balance, well, minus the college tuition, is going to the bureaucrats. That is what we need to change in Washington. If it is a good program, certainly the President should want to try to reform it and change it.

Mr. SANFORD. Where I grew up back in South Carolina, volunteering was actually volunteering. Aside from having philosophical questions about being

paid to volunteer, I think it goes back to what Davy Crockett said on the House floor, again more than 100 years ago, and that was this whole notion of there are a lot of good things we would like to do for other folks, but when we are spending other people's money to do so, I think which have to pause a real long time.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is exactly right. Here is another example of a good program that went bad, the Earned Income Tax Credit. Now, the Earned Income Tax Credit, the idea was to get people off of public assistance. But since they would not be making as much in the private sector immediately as they were when they were on welfare basically, then you give them a tax credit so they would have extra money for housing and food and insurance, and so forth.

I think that is very noble, and Ronald Reagan supported it, and TOM PETRI, who is one of our best members of our conference, has been a champion of that in the past.

But in 1993 that program was expanded, and expanded rapidly, and here is what some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are doing to capitalize on the fact this is basically free money. This is an actual mailing that went out to constituents of a Member of Congress. Listen to this.

Put some money in your pocket. The Earned Income Tax Credit. You may be eligible for as much as $2,258 tax credit. See details on back. Come clean. Your money. Did you work in '94?

What is ironic about this is you don't even have to work now under the Clinton changes, you can prefile and get your money advanced before you actually do the work. It says you are eligible if this and that. ''Even if you do not owe income tax, you can get EIC. Want more information?'' Call another toll-free number, the IRS.

I have deleted the Member's picture for decorum purposes, but it has a picture of the Member of Congress. It has his address, and it has his office number, and so forth.

So obviously what Members of Congress are doing with the Earned Income Tax Credit are not doing this as a champion of the poor. This is a paid brochure. It is a public money giveaway. The bottom line here is not to help the poor; the bottom line is to keep people in Congress and keep the poor dependent on them. ''Hey, you want your check? Send me back to Congress.'' That is totally wrong and totally against the spirit of what a public assistance program is.

Mr. SANFORD. I would simply agree with the gentleman in that there are too many things with the way Washington works that do not reward savings, they do not reward investment, they do not reward hard work, and a lot of things in essence are tied to feeding people in essence with a spoon, keeping them tied to the government knot, rather than having them out there. Again, what we need to reward in American society is initiative.

Mr. KINGSTON. Here is another example of a program gone amuck. This was sent to me by Mr. E.R. Lott of Folkston, GA. It is a copy of a letter to the editor by Brenton Bradbury in Jacksonville to the Florida Times Union.

It said,

> An expensively dressed woman came into my office a few days ago to rent a house I had advertised in the paper. I took a chance and rented the house to her, despite her bad credit, because her income was good. She paid the month's rent and a security deposit, a total of $1,130 in cash.

What makes this situation remarkable is that this household's very substantial income, expected to exceed $46,000 this year, is derived entirely from the Government and welfare programs. This 36-year-old mother of four teenage children also has her elderly disabled mother living with her. One of the teenagers is retarded, one is pregnant. When I added up the various income amounts listed in the rental application, I was astounded, then angry.

I telephoned the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services and learned it is all perfectly legal. Their monthly income includes two welfare checks totaling $1,510, an Aid to Families with Dependent Children check for $214, food stamps worth $440, a Housing and Urban Development housing check for $550, Medicaid benefits worth $550 a month, and a projected $426 per month from AFDC when the daughter's new baby arrives.

He goes on to say that, ''In addition, they will have a housekeeper come in twice a week at a cost of $242 a month that is paid for by the government.''

It goes on and on and on. But it says their household income is $46,784.08, and it is all legal.

Then Mr. Bradbury concludes, ''Ever wonder where your tax dollars are going? This is out of control. This is something that is scary.''

Now, I know we could make the case and others will make the case that this women deserves every penny of it, and perhaps she needs or the baby needs some of this money. But $46,000 a year? Basically by taking advantage of government programs?

This is the real world, this is a real world case. Any Member of this House who wants a copy of that article, I will be glad to send it to them. But this is where your money is going. This is why we are trying to reform government. We are trying to do this not maliciously. We are saying, you know, you can help people, but you do not have to give it all away to do it.

Mr. SANFORD. I think this is what really gets underneath the skin of folks back home, these kinds of horror stories. I think what we also have to remember, we proposed fairly radical welfare reform, which I think is absolutely needed. But at the same time, I think what we are doing is preserving that hand-up element to welfare. In other words, when people are really down, what we have said is we are not going to abandon them.

To give you an idea of that, again, the budget is constantly talked about as being extreme, extreme, extreme. Yet, over the past 7 years, we spent $492 billion on welfare. What is proposed here with the next 7 years is $878 billion on welfare. That does not seem extreme to me. It seems to me it preserves the helping hand nature, but it ends that hand-out nature.

Mr. KINGSTON. Also, what our program does is lets States have some flexibility. I was in Savannah talking to a caseworker a month ago, and he said, you know, I could use some flexibility. If you combine the WIC program with AFDC, I will have some money and more latitude to help the people who need it, and you can get rid of some bureaucrats and I can do my job better.

I believe we need to have State flexibility, and that is what the block granting is all about. The other thing our program does is says if you are able to work, you have to work. If you are disabled, you have 435 Members of Congress who want to help you out. But if you can work, we believe it is time.

Remember, again, we have a $4 trillion debt, almost 5, and again, we are spending $50,000 per second as a Federal Government already. It is time to get these things under control.

Now, another program that the President does not want to reform, does not want to give an inch on, is the student loan program. I have a September 24 article written by Joseph Perkins, which also was in the Savannah Morning News. He talks about the White House, President Clinton's visit to Southern Illinois University. He talked to student leaders at a roundtable.

There was press there, his PR press, which we know is the network news, surrounding him to show this real live thing. But what Mr. Perkins says, unfortunately, the White House carefully screened all the students who were let in the room so the only people who got to talk to the President were the ones who were in complete agreement. He said there was one guy, a 24-year-old William Karrow, president of Southern Illinois Graduate Student Council, who had the audacity to suggest that maybe the President was picturing a distorted picture, and the White House bounced him out of the room and he was asked to leave the room.

So on the evening news, the President got the kind of coverage he was looking for, carefully selected adoring students promising that he would fight to protect their loans from the GOP.

Now, here is what Mr. Perkins says about the Republican plan. Student loans will actually increase 50 percent over the next 7 years. They will go from $24 to $36 billion. Now, in addition to that, Mr. Perkins goes on to point out that Pell grants have increased to the highest level, and he alks about the TRIO Program and the supplemental education opportunity grants going to $583 million, the TRIO Program, which

is flat and goes strictly to basically disadvantaged students, $463 million.

This is what is happening with student loans. The Republican Party is not trying to rip the guts out of student loans, but the President will not even admit that there are problems with it. For example, as you know, the direct loan program lost $1.5 billion last year. We are just trying to correct it and make it more efficient. But at the same time, we are trying to increase student loans 50 percent.

Mr. SANFORD. I think what you are really getting at is the relatively gradual nature that is being proposed. Again, what we are talking about is overall Federal spending still going up by 2.4 percent each year. To give you an idea in relative terms of where that stands, take, for instance, right now our deficit is basically 2.2 percent of the whole economy. In France, it is about 2.5 percent, and in Sweden it is about 7.5 percent.

As you know, those countries have proposed cutting back on the size of their government. But what is interesting is we proposed to do this over 7 years. France has proposed to do it over 2 years. Sweden has proposed to do it over 3 years. What that means is the slowing of the rate of government that they are proposing, or the cuts in government they are proposing, are eight times as great in Sweden, and three times as great in France.

So, again, it goes back to, I think, the reasonableness nature that you were getting at.

Mr. KINGSTON. But, you know, a speaker earlier tonight, the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] raised a very good point, and his point was that this is a profound debate. I agree with him. This is a profound debate, because we are talking about two different visions of government.

Now, the gentleman from South Carolina earlier tonight talked about ancient civilizations that had fallen because of financial problems, and so forth. But the other thing that they have fallen, or the other consequence has actually been war, civil wars, internal strifes, coups, assassinations, and so forth.

I am proud we are not doing that in America. But when I draw that parallel, I am not totally off the farm here, because we are talking about a fundamental change in government. We are talking about shifting power from one group, basically a group in Washington who wants to handle and control everything, to another group outside of Washington, and those people are your neighbors, your associates at work, the folks at the grocery store, people that you see on the city streets. They are regular, normal people.

□ 2100

And what we want to do is go back to a time in America where those folks control their own destiny, their own towns, their own communities and make their own decisions.

I think there is an exciting opportunity out there to let, for example, the counties, and I represent 22 counties in the First District of Georgia, and I know the gentleman has multiple counties in South Carolina, to let our own counties control our own poverty, our own health care, our own ways of doing business. Does that mean that Government will be gone at $12 trillion over the next 7 years? There is no way.

The Federal Government is not going away, but the Federal Government is taking a step back and saying, hey, maybe there is a lot of brilliance back home.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SANFORD. I think what the gentleman is getting at is balance, because I think what we both recognize is that over the years the Federal Government has done a lot of good things, whether that is with helping in cleaning up some of the rivers that were burning not that long ago, or whether it has been with educational programs, or bringing us out of the Great Depression, or bringing us through World War II. The Federal Government has done a lot of good things, but the pendulum has swung too far over here, and what I hear from back home is it has done a lot of wonderful things, but it is too far over here, because we want a little greater hand in educating our children.

We want a greater hand in how we spend the hours of our day. We want to have a little greater hand in deciding a whole host of things; and, therefore, we just have to bring the pendulum back over here a bit, so that we at the individual level or the county level or at the State level are making those decisions rather than the bureaucrat in Washington.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is right, and when the gentleman thinks about, well, the Government is getting out of this, there are 163 different job training programs. Now, if we cut 25 of them out or 20 of them out, the headline would be Republican party cuts out 20 job training programs. They will not say there are 143 of them still around. And yet, in addition, there are a lot of State programs and even local programs.

The EPA. We are getting a lot of criticism now for cutting EPA, and we have not passed that bill. These things are being negotiated. But recently I had the opportunity to talk to the National Association of State EPA counterparts. I do not know the exact name of their organization, but these were folks who were basically State EPA directors, and I thought, man, I am walking into a lion's den, but here is what I found.

No. 1, I found capable, intelligent, bright people, people who were close to the polluted river, close to the smokestack that was putting the dirty air in the atmosphere, and they were very much on top of the situation. They had a lot more hands-on experience than people in Washington.

No. 2, what I found is that they were not afraid of the EPA stepping back, because 20 years ago, or over 20 years ago now, when the EPA was started, their organizations were not in existence, and they have grown over 20 years. There is a lot that has come forward in the States in terms of environmental cleanup, in terms of health care, and in terms of poverty and so forth.

So just because the Federal Government is withdrawing its horns every so slightly in certain areas, it does not mean that there is not a presence of pollution enforcement or helping poverty programs or public assistance benefits and so forth. And yet that is what we are charged with over and over again. It is an absolute distortion of what really is going on here.

Mr. SANFORD. I would agree.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude with this. Our vision is to have a balanced budget. We are not cutting the budget and we are not freezing it. We are increasing spending 3 trillion new dollars over the next 7 years. The President wants to increase it $4 trillion over the next 7 years. We can negotiate that. That is the American part.

Mr. SANFORD. I would say, in the midst of that debate, I have talked to folks back home, and they get awfully frustrated with the seeming fractiousness over Washington, yet what I tell folks at home is let us keep it all in perspective. We can look at a place like, for instance, Cuba, and we look at any kind of disagreement basically being squashed because there is a dictatorial rule, or we look at a host of places around the globe and we see people solving problems with guns rather than with words. And what we have going on right here, as messy as it is, I have heard that saying, that if one likes sausage, do not watch it being made. I guess the same is true with democracy. But what we have here is everybody yanking on the level of government control that was afforded them by the Founding Fathers; the Congress with its power to appropriate, and the President with his power to veto, all within the confines of a system that the Founding Fathers created. I think that is kind of exciting.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is right, and we are debating, along with the 3 trillion new dollars versus the 4 trillion new dollars, we are debating the role of government and releasing power out of the hands of Washington bureaucrats and empowering citizens, friends and neighbors, and putting it on the streets and in the cities and counties all across America.

The benefits of what we are doing, if we can balance the budget in 7 years, as Alan Greenspan said, interest rates will go down. If interest rates go down, we will have lower home mortgages, lower student loans, lower car payments, but probably most importantly is that we will have more jobs and more prosperity in the economy.

Now, this is a very difficult process. We are going to go through with it. As

we started out saying earlier, we believe that it is time. It is timely to get the Federal Government employees back to work. We want to pay those folks who are working. We want to get the ones who are not working back on the job, and we think that is the right thing to do.

We want to move that issue from the table, or speaking at least for myself, so that we can get to this focus on the 7-year balanced budget. I am hearing a lot of people saying, of course, I support a balanced budget, but they did not vote for it and they have not cosponsored one. There are Democrats and Republicans who have voted for a balanced budget and have cosponsored one, but there are a lot who have not.

I do not believe a Member has the right to come to the well and say they support a budget if they do not have one at this point, because the people of America pay us $134,000 a year not just to criticize what the other side is doing but to bring our own ideas to the table. If Members have their own ideas, they can criticize mine, but if they are just sitting there criticizing without a plan of their own, maybe they should return some of their paycheck permanently.

With that, Mr. Speaker, we yield back the balance of our time.

REPUBLICANS' GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AFFECTS THE COUNTRY'S MOST VULNERABLE CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, before my colleagues and I get started this evening, I would just like to make one comment about the commentary of the prior speaker having to do with the earned income tax credit, a program that, I might add, was started by President Ronald Reagan. And to refresh people's memories, he was a Republican President of the United States. President Reagan started the program to help to keep working families off of welfare.

I might also remind my colleagues of the words of another Republican, Mr. Jack Kemp, and these were his words in October of 1995, and again I quote. ''I hope you guys'', making reference to the Republicans, ''do not go too far on removing the EITC, because that is a tax increase on low-income workers and the poor, which is unconscionable at this time.''

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, would my friend yield for 30 seconds?

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to finish my commentary and then get into our program, so I want to finish what I am going to say here.

I might also say that it is interesting that in the tax break package that is being offered by the Republican majority in this House that there was another Ronald Reagan program called the alternate minimum tax. For those who do not know what the alternate minimum tax is, this is a tax that the richest corporations in the United States pay.

President Reagan, with very good thought and vision, put this into practice, because oftentimes the richest corporations in this country, when they took all of their deductions, would find that they had a zero tax obligation. He thought, as did others, that it would be unfair to have that occur, that the richest corporations in the country would not be paying some portion or a fair share of taxes the way that ordinary Americans pay their taxes. So he put in a 20 percent rate, and the Congress approved of a 20 percent rate on the richest corporations in the country.

Into that tax package that the Republicans are proposing, the $245 billion tax break package, the alternate minimum tax is repealed, repealed, which means that, once again, if this passes and is law, that the richest corporations in the United States will have a zero tax obligation. It is a $17 billion windfall to the richest corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I want to remind my Republican colleagues about that, and I also want to remind the listening public that what Mr. Kemp says, that tampering with the earned income tax credit, which the Republican package does in cutting the earned income tax credit, is an increase on taxes for working families at the same time as my Republican colleagues are decreasing taxes for the richest corporations in this Nation.

No wonder the public said to the President of the United States, 60 percent of the public said veto Mr. GINGRICH's budget bill and do not balance the budget on the backs of seniors and Medicare and Medicaid, and on students and education, and on working families with being unfair to them in terms of taxes.

My colleagues are here tonight so that we may have an opportunity to talk about something that is on everyone's minds, everyone's lips, and it is in all of the news. And what we have tried to do is to organize a special order tonight on behalf of the millions of senior citizens in this country and their families who are sitting at their kitchen tables tonight struggling to cope with the impact of the Government shutdown. Day No. 20.

Our seniors, including many of this Nation's veterans, live on fixed incomes. They do not have money to fall back on when their benefits are cut off. Now, these vulnerable citizens have become pawns in what is a very, very cynical political game being played by House Republicans, who are refusing to open the Federal Government, despite what they tell the public. They had the opportunity to open the Federal Government 12 times, the latest was yesterday.

Let us be clear about what is happening here. The President of the United States, the Democrats, responsible Republicans all agree that it is time to end the Government shutdown and it is time for Speaker GINGRICH and the right wing extremists in the House to stop holding America's seniors hostage to their political games. It is power politics at its worst, is what we are watching.

BOB DOLE, and I don't have the quote up here, but I will get it, BOB DOLE, the Republican majority leader of the other body, wants to reopen the Government. He said enough is enough, and he is right. He is absolutely right. He said that this has gone about as far as it can go. We need now to put people back to work.

I don't want to misquote the majority leader. This is what he says. ''I don't see any sense in what we have been doing. I would hope that we would have quick action in the House. People have been gone from their jobs long enough. Enough is enough.''

□ 2115

And that quote was on January 2, 1996.

Now, how are seniors affected by the shutdown of the Federal Government? That is what my colleagues and I are here to talk about tonight. In my own district, the Third District of Connecticut, the Veterans Hospital in West Haven Connecticut cannot now legally pay for anything. They must depend on vendors to continue to provide, without payment, food, hearing aids, glasses, medical supplies, ambulance services and all of the lifesaving treatments provided our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Vincent Ng, the director of VA Hospitals in Connecticut, said ''We will do whatever is necessary to care for our patients. We hope our contractors will support the needs of the medical centers during this crisis situation so that we will be able to maintain our full standard of patient care.''

Our Nation's veterans should not be forced into paying for the failings of this Congress. Men and women who have put their lives on the line for this Congress and for this country deserve better than that.

Mr. Speaker, it is just not the veterans who are being hurt, but those who care for them as well. One VA employee called my office today to explain that he had received a paycheck of one week's pay and two weeks' worth of deductions. He called because he does not have any money for food. We made a reference for him and we directed him to the nearest food bank, to the nearest food pantry.

He is not alone. The plight of the VA employees in my district prompted Mayor Richard Borer of West Haven, CT, to make a public plea for donations to the local food shelters to help feed workers who are now not being paid. The people who care for our veterans deserve better.

The crisis facing our elderly veterans extends to every single State in this

Nation. If the Government shutdown continues, veterans benefits may run out. New claims are not being paid for VA pensions, rehabilitation counseling, education, and home loans.

Programs that provide food to the elderly are also in jeopardy if the Government shutdown continues. Funding for the Meals on Wheels Program has evaporated. To understand how many seniors rely on this service, let me again give an example of one of the Meals on Wheels providers in my district.

The New Haven Community Action Agency provides meals to 2,000 senior citizens every single day. Some 600,000 elderly Americans face the loss of Meals on Wheels, transportation, and personal care. What are we about in this Nation? What are these people doing to seniors and to veterans in this country?

The Meals on Wheels program in my State has suffered a 40 percent cut in funding because of the shutdown. It is unclear how much longer we will be able to carry the Federal Government's responsibilities to feed our elderly.

In addition, Federal funds to States for Medicaid have been severely limited. On December 27, States received only 40 percent of the estimated quarterly payment for Medicaid. Without further action, the Federal match for Medicaid and its 36 million beneficiaries of the Medicaid program, two-thirds are elderly and the disabled.

While the House Republican leadership refuses to reopen the Government, the Republican leadership in this body continue to take their paychecks. These same Republican leaders promised last year that they were going to make this Congress live under the same rules as everybody else, but today while seniors worry about the fate of elderly feeding programs, while veterans' health services are jeopardized, while seniors are suffering, the congressional paychecks just keep on coming to the leaders, to Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. Speaker, I am returning my congressional pay back to the U.S. Treasury and will continue to do so until the Government is reopened.

If Speaker GINGRICH and the right wing extremists in the House of Representatives who are keeping this Government closed were forced to put their paychecks on the line, I think the crisis would be over in a heartbeat.

The President, Democrats, and Republicans in the U.S. Senate all want to reopen the Government and stop inflicting pain on our seniors and veterans. But a small band of extremists in this body are holding America hostage. Yesterday, when the Democrats voted to try to reopen the Government, only 2 Republicans were brave enough to join us. Only 2.

Democrats need 20 good Republicans. Twenty. Mr. Speaker, 197 Democrats are prepared to have voted to reopen this Government. We need 20 Republican votes. So, I am pleading with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to have the courage, have the courage to do the right thing, to show their allegiance to the American people instead of their allegiance to NEWT GINGRICH. Join us to reopen the Government and restore the services that the taxpayers have paid for and are paying for every single day that this Government is shut down. We only need 20 good Republicans, 20 patriots.

The 20-day Government shutdown is affecting more and more Americans. Seniors have been hit extremely hard, and remember, most older Americans live on extremely limited monthly budgets and are not able to compensate for the loss of vital Federal benefits.

Our Nation's veterans and other senior citizens should not be asked to pay the price of the Gingrich Government shutdown.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield time to my colleagues who have joined me on the floor tonight so we can engage in a dialog and discussion on this issue. I yield to my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. FRANK PALLONE, who has been a real warrior in this effort to reopen our Government and real friend of America's senior citizens.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] for yielding to me tonight, and also to praise her for the fact that she is focusing tonight on how the shutdown particularly affects senior citizens and veterans.

I think it is important that we zero in on certain groups, because I think that is what the Republican Majority has done. Last night we talked a great deal about the EPA and environment and health and safety measures that are not being taken during the shutdown because the Republican majority effectively zeroed in on environmental protection and quality of life issues and has taken it upon themselves not only to shut down EPA and other such agencies, but also to cut back on funding and cripple these agencies in the future.

I think we are seeing the same thing happen with senior citizens. This whole debate over the budget is largely a function of Medicare and Medicaid. The fact that Democrats are opposed to the idea of giving huge tax breaks to wealthy Americans and taking money away from Medicare and Medicaid in order to fund those tax breaks.

Well, senior citizens are mostly impacted by cuts in Medicare as well as Medicaid, and I think it is no surprise, therefore, that a lot of the impact of this shutdown is falling squarely on senior citizens and also on veterans.

I just wanted, if I could, to spend a couple of minutes talking about what is happening in my home State of New Jersey. New Jersey right now is facing a financial crisis because of the Federal Government shutdown. It is particularly impacting senior citizens.

In order to pay for human services in New Jersey, the State borrowed yesterday $250 million to pay for Social Security services for the poor and elderly. The interest rates on these loans will be picked up by New Jersey taxpayers, while these same taxpayers watch services deteriorate.

Mr. Speaker, this is costing us money. Our constituents are seeing less and less services and they are going to have to pay more for it. If we look at the services provided to the elderly under the Older Americans Act, they are very much threatened right now in the State of New Jersey. In Middlesex County in my district, over 11,000 seniors directly benefit from the Older American Act programs, including Meals on Wheels.

The State is seeking to provide my county Offices on Aging with just enough money to keep the Meals on Wheels and the senior nutrition programs going for the rest of this month, but all the other programs funded under the Older Americans Act are threatened. This includes home health care, visiting nurses, critical care management, friendly visits, information referral services, legal services. There is no money available for these programs, many of which are essential for seniors' well-being and avoiding institutionalization.

I know that the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] has always stressed, as I have, preventive care. We do not have any prevention anymore during the shutdown. Another example is the loss of money for emergency housing assistance for seniors who cannot pay the rent.

We know that nationwide 10,000 Social Security workers have been laid off, putting a strain on the entire operation during what is the busiest month of the year, the beginning of the year. And it has been impossible for seniors to get through to the 800 number in the northeast region, and my office got a lot of calls complaining about this. Apparently, because of the lapse of the tax on airline tickets, the airline 800 numbers have been swamped with calls and, therefore, that blocks the use of the Social Security 800 number. It sounds like a minor impact, but it is very important.

Mr. Speaker, I called the Small Business Administration in New York-New Jersey and found it shut down completely and this affects the statewide SCORE program, in which retired businessmen provide assistance to small businesses and other businesses which help accommodate the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk briefly about veterans. Every work day that Congress fails to provide funding to the Department of Veterans Affairs, 500 widows and other beneficiaries will not be paid the proceeds of veterans life insurance policies. There is no staff available to handle the claims because of the furloughs. Think about it. How would my colleagues like it if their spouse was unable to collect their life insurance benefits if they were to die? For this reason alone, I think the Republicans should support the continuing resolution.

As my colleague from Connecticut mentioned, employees of veterans hospitals are being forced to work without pay. I commend them for their dedication, but these employees are going to lose their motivation to work for the VA at some point. We are talking about veterans who dedicated their lives to this country. I just think it is totally outrageous.

The gentlewoman from Connecticut mentioned Medicare and Medicaid. It is reported in today's Star Ledger, which is our largest circulation daily in New Jersey, that in the State Human Services Department, the Secretary has said that the department faces the greatest potential for disruption at this point. Each day the Federal dispute goes on, the likelihood increases that a scheduled $130 million payment for Medicaid is going to be delayed and, of course, Medicaid, the majority of it, is used for medical care or nursing home care for senior citizens.

Let us look at the headlines of some of the papers about how our State, New Jersey, is really feeling the impact of this, and again the major impact or a significant part of the impact is on senior citizens and veterans. I just think it is so unfair. So many of us started this whole budget debate, if you will, and came to the floor months ago because we were concerned about the impact of these Republican cuts on Medicaid and Medicare, and now we are seeing the same senior citizens immediately affected by this Government shutdown.

I wanted to say one thing, and I will yield back, which is that I am somewhat encouraged by the fact that the gentlewoman mentioned that we only need 20 Republicans in order to get this continuing resolution passed and the Government open again. I heard that yesterday in the Republican conference there were 54 Republicans who wanted to vote for that. Really, the blame now is entirely on the Republican House leadership, on Speaker GINGRICH and the others, because they are afraid to bring this up because they know if they bring up the continuing resolution, we will get enough Republican votes to pass this with all the Democrats. Hopefully reason will prevail and if we keep this up, as the gentlewoman has so well, we are going to see some light over the next few days.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey. I think that it is largely because it is what BOB DOLE said: ''Enough is enough.'' And it was a bipartisan consensus in the Senate to bring people back to work, let them earn their pay, and let us then sort out what budget differences that we have.

□ 2130

I also just want to mention one point because I am so delighted that you brought it up before I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, that it is this whole notion of focusing on balanced budget is just political posturing, because the issue has been what it always has been, what are our priorities in this budget. We all want to see our fiscal house be put in order.

A $245 billion tax break for the wealthiest Americans is not putting our fiscal house in order, especially at the expense of Medicare, Medicaid, education, and the environment.

Our Republican colleagues would like to continue to mask what they are doing, and I thank the gentleman for bringing that issue up again.

I now yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN], who has represented Federal employees in the very, very best manner possible.

Mr. FROST. If the gentlewoman will yield for just a moment, I have just been informed, for members of the Committee on Rules who may be watching this debate, that the Committee on Rules will meet at 10 o'clock this evening, in 30 minutes, to consider a resolution on this particular matter of the Government shutdown. We do not know all the details, but that there will be a Committee on Rules meeting at 10, and I hope that something constructive will come from that.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. I would encourage members of the Committee on Rules to find their way to the Committee on Rules by 10 o'clock.

Mr. MORAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for yielding to me, but more importantly for her continuing commitment to educate not just her constituents but this great Nation on what issues are at stake here, why we have come to this crisis.

It is a contrived crisis in terms of the Government shutdown. But the American people need to understand why the President cannot in good conscience accept the Republican 7-year plan, as the gentlewoman from Connecticut and the gentleman from New Jersey have continually emphasized he cannot. I do not think any President could in good conscience, knowing that it only takes $90 billion to make the Medicare Program solvent, cut the Medicare Program by $270 billion so that you can take $180 billion and pay it out in tax cut for the most affluent Americans.

In my State of Virginia, only 3.7 percent of the entire population of the State of Virginia would get the majority of those tax breaks. Now, they may all live in my district, but the point is, even so, it is wrong, and we do not want him to accept such a substantial cut in a high-priority national program in order to make the kinds of tax cuts that put us in this situation in the first place.

If it were not for those tax cuts in 1981, we would be in a surplus today, and, in fact, we probably would not even have a Federal debt. It is the interest we are paying on the debt incurred during the Reagan administration alone, just that debt, the interest on that debt is greater than the deficit today, which means if it were not for the debt incurred primarily because of those 1981 tax cuts, we would have a surplus budget today.

So let us understand where this problem originated, and here we are, deja vu. We are going to do the same thing all over again. We are going to start out with tax cuts that are politically popular, and then, now, the Republicans are promising, ''Well, we are not going to do that, just tax cuts. We are going to cut your programs.'' Wait and see.

The President cannot in good conscience accept such a dramatic cut in a program like Medicare when two-thirds of the cut goes into tax cuts. But it is not just dollars and cents, as the gentlewoman and gentleman have been emphasizing night after night. We know that about 60 percent of the Medicare population only cost the system about $500 a year. Ninety percent of Medicare beneficiaries cost the Medicare Program less than $1,300 a year.

The Republican plan, and they are absolutely right, it does increase each year, it starts by giving vouchers of about $4,800 a year and goes up to about $6,800. But think of this: If 90 percent of your population is only going to cost about $1,300 and you are getting a voucher of $4,800, there is a tremendous profit to be made. How? By avoiding the 10 percent who cost the system $29,000 a year.

And the reason the President cannot accept this Medicare plan is not just the cuts that go into tax breaks but it restructures the program. It tears down a fundamental concept, what we think is an American principle. It is called community rating. That is the technical term. But what it says is we are all in this together. Those 10 percent of the people that cost the system $29,000 in a year, they could be any of our parents or grandparents. We do not know who it is going to be. But if somebody has to have that help to stay alive, has to have that expensive treatment, the American people feel that it is the right thing to meet that need. That is community rating, and if somebody needs it, then the money will be there. That is what insurance is supposed to be all about.

But when you turn it over, when you privatize it, when you turn it over to managed care, what it will do is to set all of these various insurance companies who have as their motive profit, the Medicare program costs about 1.2 percent in administrative costs, and managed care companies, and many of them are wonderful, but their average profit was about 20 percent last year. Twenty percent of the premium goes into profit. They are going to go out, their bottom line being profit, and they are going to target this 90 percent of the Medicare program that will not cost them much to provide care for, and they are going to make a tremendous profit.

In fact, in the 15 States where we did test cases, very interesting, it cost the Medicare program more money because by managed care companies going in,

targeting this population, making it very difficult for anybody that is really sick or infirm to go in to many of the managed care plans, they stay in fee-for-service. And they wind up segmenting the population, and that 10 percent winds up being really dependent upon public hospitals at a much greater expense. That is what is going to happen under this program.

That 10 percent is not going to get the care they need. In fact, they are going to pay astronomical costs eventually in out-of-pocket expenses for care that they desperately need. That is what it is all about.

The medical savings accounts that we hear so much about, it is touted so much, and, of course, just follow the money trail. We know why it got into the bill in the first place: because of all the substantial donations to GOPAC and so on.

But the point is that last year the principal insurance company that offers medical savings accounts, of the insurance premiums that they received, 40 percent went for profit. Only 60 percent of the premiums they received went for medical care. So now we want to turn this over to a national program where 40 percent of the premiums the American people pay are going to go into corporate profit instead of medical care? No. We cannot allow it to be done. And that is what is happening. That is why the President cannot accept it.

Just quickly on Medicaid, that may be a worse situation. In Medicaid, the Governor of Virginia was one of the Governors, Republican Governors, who wrote a letter asking that onerous provisions be removed from the Medicaid program. What were the onerous provisions? Spousal impoverishment protection and the regulations that were passed during the Reagan administration. The spousal impoverishment provision, which says that if your spouse is in a nursing home, then the State cannot go and seize your home and your automobile and all of your assets, that has been weakened by this bill.

So, now, every spouse that has a spouse in a nursing home is threatened with not being able to hold on to their home and their assets.

What President Reagan did was to protect them up to at least $14,000 of assets. Gone.

And the other thing that the Republican Governors are so insistent about they do not want the regulations that were put in in 1987 in the light of unbelievable abuses in nursing homes where people were living in squalor, where they were strapped down, where they were drugged so they could not even talk, so that you would not have to provide for them, because when you do provide for them, when you do not drug them, when you do not strap them down in bed, then it requires a lot more personnel. Personnel are expensive.

If the States are on their own, they are going to be able to fire these personnel and go back to the old days of treating people without dignity, without respect, in inhumane ways. That is what we are afraid of. That is why we do not want the President to accept what we call structural changes. They are profound changes. They are threats to the entire concept, all the values that we have established throughout our generation, for the last 50 years, based upon the principle that everyone deserves respect, dignity, everybody has an opportunity to live out their lives with some concern, some care, and their family, even if they cannot afford it, to be able to be sure that their loved one is not going to be abused. That is what we are talking about: abused, exploited, and treated without human dignity. We cannot allow this country to go back to the inhumane conditions that gave rise to these protections. That would be eviscerated in this bill. It is wrong. The President cannot in good conscience accept it.

Those are some of the reasons why we are in the situation we are in, and they are reasons why the President cannot yield. What we have to do is go back to the way we have always done things in the past, get a continuing resolution, an interim spending bill, let the Government function, try to work things out. Then, if it comes to it, let next November be a national referendum on such profound issues.

I thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut for giving me the opportunity to spend some time with you.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman. Thank you for going through those various programs.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to add something, because I am so glad that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] brought up how profound the differences are in some of these budget issues, particularly Medicare and Medicaid.

I was very aggravated, if you will, last night when I listened to some of our Republican colleagues suggest that, oh, there is nothing really to this, you know, the President can just sit down and split the difference on some of the numbers in terms of Medicare and Medicaid with the Republicans and everything will be fine, and he can sign the bill and all the Government employees can go back to work.

These are profound differences. Just briefly, on the Medicaid issue, which I consider really probably the most important issue, they are talking, the Republican leadership, essentially, with this budget, is talking about destroying Medicaid as we know it. The whole basis of Medicaid is that if you are below a certain income and need health insurance, that you are guaranteed the health insurance and that you are guaranteed a certain package of health insurance that provides for health care, that is necessary for a lot of low-income people.

Again, most of the money goes to pay for senior citizens, and what they are doing here is just saying we are going to block grant, we are going to cut the amount of money available, we are going to send it to the States, and we are going to let the State decide whether or not they want to cover certain people and what kind of benefits they want to give them.

Now, we know that is going to mean a lot of seniors who are now in nursing homes are not going to be eligible for nursing home care paid for through Medicaid. We know a lot of disabled people are probably not going to be on the eligibility list.

Of course, all the other things built into the Federal program that you mentioned, the nursing home standards, the fact that they cannot go after certain spousal assets or go after the assets of children, all of these things are thrown by the wayside. So we are talking about the end of Medicaid as we know it, and unless there is some sort of Federal guarantee that the people who now receive Medicaid would continue to receive it, the President cannot possibly agree to this.

So it is not just a question of splitting the numbers. You know, the Republicans, I think are talking about cutting $185 billion in Medicaid, and the President has said, well, perhaps the program can be cut by $35 billion or so. It is not just a question of splitting the numbers. This is a profound difference.

The Republicans are trying to basically eliminate the Medicaid Program as we know it. The same is true for Medicare.

Mr. MORAN. If the gentlewoman would yield for just a moment for a response, it is also true that there will no longer be any guarantee that everyone be treated at least equally within the State. The Governor can discriminate geographically, demographically, any way they want. It really does come down to the concept of community where we all care about our neighbors versus the concept of survival of the fittest.

□ 2145

This debate is instructive, important, and we ought to have it. Some people would say ''Look, if I am young and healthy, I should not have to support old and sick people. That is not my responsibility. I am on my own.''

That is a fair, legitimate point of view. And people in this country ought to make that determination, what this country is all about.

Others would say if we can afford to as a Government, then everyone has the right to live in some manner of dignity, with some basic minimal standards of respect and care, because we do not know when we are going to become impoverished, become sick, become dependent upon others.

Now, the American people ought to make these kinds of choices between the concept of community and the concept of survival of the fittest. But it ought to be done in a knowledgeable

way, it ought to be a national referendum. That election is 1994, where you had less than 40 percent of the people vote, certainly was not a mandate to eviscerate, to cast aside the concept of community that has guided this country and made it the greatest country in the world at the greatest time ever to live in the United States of America. There was no mandate given to do that.

Now, if the American people want to give that kind of a mandate next November, they will have an opportunity to decide. But that is how this ought to be decided, as a national referendum, not by holding Federal employees hostage and by these kinds of tactics of terrorism that we are seeing played out on the floor of this House day after day.

Ms. DELAURO. I would just say it is a question of values, where are our American values. I think the public has a very clear idea of where those values are in looking at protecting Medicare and Medicaid, the education for our young people, our environment, and making sure that working families can see their way in this country. That is what it is about, values.

I would like to yield to my colleague, the minority whip, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. I thank my colleague for yielding and taking this time this evening and for engaging in this debate and this dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, I want to go back, if I can, to a theme that we had been talking about and are still talking about that sometimes tends to get lost in this debate we are now engaged in with respect to the Government, and that is the whole question of what we are fighting for in this budget debate. We have talked about that this evening. But I want to reemphasize to people the Medicare piece, and why we feel so strongly about Medicare.

The Department of Labor this year did an analysis of what the income levels of our seniors were in this country. They found that 60 percent, 6-0, 60 percent of our seniors had incomes of $10,000 a year or less. That is combined Social Security and retirement income, $10,000 a year or less.

Now, what we have witnessed this year with these Medicare dismantling proposals by our colleagues, our Republican colleagues, is an additional cost out-of-pocket for these people who make $10,000 a year or less of probably close to $500.

When you add on top of that what the insurance industry plans to charge these people with respect to their Medigap insurance, you are talking another $300 to $500. We are talking about 10 percent of their income.

That is way we feel so strongly about this, because the proportion of shared burden here is not falling the way we think a community ought to deal with a question of this magnitude.

We are, as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN] said, a country that has a sense of community, and this is really in many ways a question of is it the survival of the fittest, or are we going to act to take care of each other, to take care of our fathers and grandmothers and grandfathers and mothers who went before us. The folks now who are seniors are folks who fought, they went through the Depression, they saved this country and the western world, civilization, for democracy and freedom and justice. And here they are; they struggled all their lives, and these folks get to the point where they want to take a deep breath and try to enjoy the last remaining years, and we are sticking them, they are sticking them, excuse me, with a $1,000 bill basically.

That is what this is about in many ways. I could make the same case on Medicaid. Why are we so firm in our position with respect to Medicaid? Because 25 percent of the kids in this country get their health insurance through Medicaid. It is because so many of our seniors depend upon it for long-term care. It is because our disabled depend upon it.

Heaven knows, each one of us, someone in our family could be in that position at the drop of a hat, and they are. So when we fight for Medicaid and we fight for Medicare, we do it because it is really an important piece of community. It is an important piece of this country and what we are all about as Members of this institution, as members of our party.

So I thank the gentlewoman for taking the time this evening and for giving us an opportunity to talk about the effect on seniors. We need to get this Government back working full time. Senator DOLE was absolutely correct, enough is enough. ''I do not see any sense in what we have been doing,'' he said. I would hope that we would have a quick action in this House of Representatives. People have been gone from their jobs long enough. Enough is enough. The majority leader said that in the Senate. We need to take him at his word.

We are going to try tomorrow to bring up a clean CR. We are going to try again to get these folks back to work, these services provided to the American people, so we can get on with these budget talks and get on with the sense of community.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the minority whip. I think that you are right. The public wants to see us every day continue to fight on their behalf. So we now have had 12 votes on trying to reopen this Government. We ought to have as many as necessary, and have one everyday if that is what it takes to reopen this Government. I thank you all for your comments and for your unbelievable work in this area.

Mr. WISE. If the gentlewoman would yield, if I could just take 2 minutes at the most to just mention what the impact on seniors is in my state. We have done some checking, and the fact that the Government is shut down, a partial shutdown, still affects senior citizens greatly. For instance, we have done some checking and find out that the thousands of black lung recipients, these are coal miners who have worked a minimum of 20 years, but most often 30 or 40 years in the coal mines, and have received a determination they are 100 percent disabled as a result of pneumococcus, black lung, coal dust in their lungs. They wake up choking every morning black dust. The Department of Labor will not be able to make full black lung payments after next month if this Government remains shut down in the present state it is in.

We have many workers, of course, who are retired railroad workers. The Railroad Retirement Board tells us that 2,700 retirees in our State will see a 64-percent reduction in their vested dual benefits as a result of this shutdown if it is not alleviated quickly.

Medicare vendors will be affected as well. These are people providing services that Medicare recipients depend upon. They will be affected in the payment of their bills.

We have heard a lot about how Meals on Wheels are not affected by this, some saying they have been out there and said in such an area the program will go indefinitely. That is only if the local government picks up the share. In West Virginia, Meals on Wheels at the Federal level will not be able to continue after January 15. Yes; the State can pick up the difference. The problem is our State, like every other State, is trying to anticipate the cuts that are coming eventually in Medicaid and the other programs that are so important, and there is no money to go around.

So whether it is black lung, whether it is railroad retirees, whether it is Social Security recipients, Medicare vendors, all nature of senior citizens, the programs attendant to them, the fact that this Government is shut down, through no fault of their own, means they will not be getting these services.

I might point out, referring to the debate that is taking place over what the budget should be over the next 7 years, this is because of the Republican leadership's failure to let this Government function. The Senate leadership has said it should function, Republicans and Democrats. Democrats in the House said it should function. We voted 12 times to do so. I urge the Republican leadership to take this burden off our seniors while there is still time and before people begin to feel the pain.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia. I am delighted to recognize and have join in this conversation the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I want to commend her also for her hard work and enthusiasm and working for seniors and working for not only her constituents, but working for people all across this country. We certainly thank you for having this special order.

Let me also echo something that the gentleman from Virginia said. He talked about those people who are clothed with responsibility of regulating the Social Security have already stated that it will only need about $90 billion cut, yet Members of the other side of the aisle choose to cut it by somewhere in the neighborhood of $270 billion. So that goes to show you how far we are apart, not only Democrat-Republicans, but Republicans as relates to those individuals who are clothed with responsibility of even regulating these programs.

Also, I wanted to make mention of the fact that this is not the first time we have had a budget impasse. We have had budget impasses year after year after year. As a matter of fact, over the past 12 years, we have had 57 CR's, where we continue to operate the Government, and in the process of operating the Government we had budget negotiations. I just find it to be totally irresponsible. It is irresponsible for the Members on the other side of the aisle to hold working people in this country, Federal employees, hostage, while we try to do and complete the business of this country.

If you really look at it in the real sense, you will find it is our responsibility to run the Federal Government. We have tried, Members of this side of the aisle have tried time after time after time to try to pass CR's, to get the Government back moving, to get people back to work. We have even said listen, it is irresponsible of us as Members of Congress who are clothed with responsibility of running the Government, and half of the Government is not running, it is irresponsible of us to continue to receive pay.

So Members of this side of the aisle even went so far to say we are the last people who ought to be paid, because it is our responsibility, our fiduciary responsibility, to run this Government. If anybody should be affected by this closure, by these pay cuts, it should be us. But Members on the other side of the aisle chose not to do that.

I would hope there would be some agreement tonight in the Committee on Rules, and on tomorrow I would hope we could step on this floor and pass a CR and get this Government moving again.

The gentlewoman is right. You are talking about seniors. Seniors are affected by this. I receive calls everyday from my district. Ms. Bass, who works for the Social Security office in my district, in Louisiana, she calls every day. She had a very boring Christmas. These people live paycheck to paycheck. They do not have the luxury of having thousands upon thousands of dollars in the bank and in savings. Every nickel, every penny counts. And we ought to be ashamed of ourselves. It is all right to negotiate and it is all right to have an impasse as long as negotiations are taking place. But it is not all right to take bread off of working people's tables in this Nation.

Let me close by talking a little bit about Meals on Wheels. The gentleman who spoke before me is absolutely right. That program is affected. In my own state, they are running out of money, and January 15, the gentleman is right, the state will not have the money to subsidize this program. So a lot of seniors in my district will go without food.

These are real issues affecting real people. So I just wanted to thank the gentlewoman for taking this time and continue to fight, and I would hope that tonight some meaningful resolution will occur in the Committee on Rules and tomorrow we can get this government moving again and get people back to work.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I just want to make one point, that someone of our Republican colleagues today said on the floor that he did not hold the key to opening the Government and put the blame on the President.

Well, I would submit to my colleague and all my Republican colleagues that the voting card, which is what the people that voted us to these offices gave us, they gave us this ability, to use this card. You do not need a key, you do not need a magic bullet, you do not need anything else. You need to take this card and you need to vote ''aye'' to open this Government. That is what this is. That is what this is about.

□ 2200

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body will have the opportunity tomorrow to take a green card, to vote ''aye,'' and to open the Government completely. We will have that opportunity on the previous question on the rule. That will be the vote that will say to the American people who wants this Government closed and shut down and who wants it open; and who wants those services denied the American people, whether it is Head Start money, or whether it is contracting money for NASA projects, whether it is cleaning up our Superfund waste sites, all of these questions are going to be cloaked on whether a Member picks a red card or picks a green card.

That chance will occur tomorrow. We have a rule that will be coming out of the Committee on Rules very shortly on the floor and it will occur on the previous question on the rule. There are 12 Republican colleagues over here who have today said they want to support BOB DOLE, the majority leader in the Senate, in having a clean CR and putting this Government back to work and support the Democrats, and I urge the rest of them to join in doing that so we can get things back on track again.

Ms. DELAURO. We have 197 Democrats who are prepared to vote ''aye'' to open this Government. We need 20 good Republicans to do that.

I now would like to yield time to my colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, who has been a champion on education and other areas, and particularly on seniors.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to thank my colleague from Connecticut for this special order and focus particularly on senior citizens.

Senior citizens in New York, senior citizens in my district, certainly are experiencing an atmosphere of terror. No matter how many times we reassure them that their Social Security checks will not be affected by the shutdown; the fact that the shutdown involves the Department of Health and Human Services, the fact that Donna Shalala has been on television talking about the kinds of things that have been happening, even though she reassures people it will not affect their Social Security checks, we keep getting the calls about the Social Security checks.

New York, of course, has to bear the burden of a mean-spirited and extreme approach at three levels. Not only do we have a shutdown in Washington, but we have a mean-spirited approach in Albany, where the Governor is trying to get ahead of the Republicans here in Congress and has started imposing new rules on nursing homes already. And a mayor who is also in sync with the cuts of Medicare and Medicaid. They are applauding.

So when we have a mayor and Governor and we have a shutdown in Washington, they live in a state of mental terror. Nobody is going to do them physical harm, and probably New York State and New York City, they are big enough to borrow the money to keep the Meals on Wheels program going and any other program going, but the state of terror is such that some people are going to have their lives shortened just from worrying themselves to death.

They are worried because the mayor has said he wants to sell hospitals. And when he cannot get buyers for the hospitals, now he is willing to lease hospitals. Recently the Governor announced he is going to close down one of the largest psychiatric centers, Kingsboro Psychiatric Center, in my district. It is a large hospital, located in a big hospital center, so people think he is going to close down Kings County Hospital, which is the biggest municipal hospital in the city.

The rumors generate and people are very much frightened when they hear Medicaid being thrown into the hopper. And if there is no Medicaid entitlement, that means they are not guaranteed nursing homes. New York State has one of the biggest Medicaid and Medicare programs in the country, and they hear on television our State being criticized for being so generous. I am not so sure we are too generous. We have some very good programs and take very good care of senior citizens. With all the generosity with respect to health care, New York State still sends to the Federal Government $18 billion more. In 1994 we sent $18 billion more to the Federal Government than we got back. Before that it was $23 billion.

And for the last 20 years New York State has sent more money to the Federal Government than it has gotten back.

There are a whole wealth of States in the South and Southwest that have gotten $65 billion more in 1994 than they paid to the Federal Government, but we consistently pay more into the Federal Government than we get back. So Medicare, Medicaid, that is one of the ways our citizens get back some of their tax money.

People are terrified with the thought that all this is going to change. Because if Medicaid is no longer an entitlement, then two-thirds of our Medicaid money, which goes for nursing homes, is up for grabs. And I think this kind of special order helps to reassure them that at least Democrats here are fighting. This is a profound debate. It is also a desperate debate. We are desperately fighting to protect some very profound and concrete benefits for people who need them, and I thank the gentlewoman very much for this opportunity.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and just say what a number of my colleagues have said, that, in fact, this is worth the fight; that there are fundamental differences about the values of this Nation and its priorities and whether we stand for Medicare and Medicaid and education and the environment and for working class families in this country, or we stand for a $245 billion tax break for the wealthiest Americans.

Let me tell my colleagues that Speaker GINGRICH, since last April, has made statements about shutting down this Government. In June, he said,

> We are going to go over to the liberal Democratic part of the Government and then say to them we could last 60 days, 90 days, 120 days, 5 years, a century. There is a lot of stuff we don't care if it is ever funded. I don't care what the price is. I don't care if we have no executive offices and no bonds for 30 days. Not this time.

That was in September. The fact of the matter is he has been fanning, inflaming, and planning for a shutdown. We have a shutdown, with unbelievable desperate effects on senior citizens in this country. We sill have an opportunity to vote tomorrow with our voting card to vote ''aye'' to reopen this Government. We need 20 Republicans who will, in fact, follow the lead of their districts and the people who sent them here to serve them rather than following their allegiance to NEWT GINGRICH.

That is what this is about, and the desperate effects that this shutdown has on seniors in our communities and veterans in our communities. Do not be fooled by the rhetoric of a balanced budget. It is balanced and it helps the richest people in this country and hurts seniors and veterans and students and working families.

I want to yield now to my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. PALLONE. I just wanted to say that I am really pleased that the gentlewoman from Connecticut stresses the basic differences that there are here on this budget and how this is really a budget battle that concerns major differences on the issues of Medicare and Medicaid, education, and the environment.

I am so afraid that the public, in some ways, has got a distorted impression of why we feel that it is incumbent to bring up a continuing resolution to open up the Government again. Historically, in this House and in the Congress, when there have been differences over appropriations bills, differences over the budget, everyone has agreed to continue the Government, let it operate while those negotiations go on. That is all we are asking. We want the Government open while these budget negotiations go on. And I think there is a responsibility of the Republican majority to do that.

Ms. DELAURO. This argument is directed at a Democratic President.

DEBATE IS ABOUT WHETHER THE WHITE HOUSE AND CONGRESS ARE IN AGREEMENT OVER BALANCING THE BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is recognized for 55 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I understand I have 55 minutes and the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS], the gentleman after me, has 55 minutes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is true.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be joined by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE].

Mr. Speaker, I was elected to the State House of Representatives in 1974, and it never ceased to amaze me, when I saw my colleagues in Congress having to form a budget, that they did not have to balance the budget. It never ceased to amaze me that unlike the State house, where our revenues had to equal expenditures, men and women in Congress continued to deficit spend and put us in an incredible hole of obligations.

Mr. Rabin, before he was assassinated, said that he was elected by adults to represent the children and the children's children. And this is what this issue is all about. We have Federal employees who are innocent victims, but, ultimately, they will be paid. But they have to now survive without pay. They are caught in the middle.

But this is not about Federal employees. This is not even about the disruption of services. It is about whether or not there is an agreement in Congress with the White House to finally balance our Federal budget, get our financial house in order, Save Medicare from bankruptcy and, ultimately, to change this social and corporate welfare State into what I would refer to as an opportunity society, an opportunity for all Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are gathered here now in a very significant debate. I have differences with my colleagues on the other side, as I am sure others of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have. We are trying to get our financial house in order and balance our Federal budget.

We presented a budget that we worked on for 11 months. Our budget, in some cases with discretionary spending, which is the running of Government, the various departments and agencies, we made real reductions. We spent less in some programs and departments than we did in this year's budget.

We eliminate a department, we reduce the size of other departments, we consolidate agencies, and we attempt to, in a 7-year plan, balance the Federal budget.

In terms of entitlements, which are half of our Federal budget, we are looking to slow the growth of entitlements. We are not cutting them; we are spending more. I am just going to read the expenditures of five programs that our colleagues just previously made reference to. They called it cuts. Only in this place, in this city of Washington, when you spend so much more do people call it a cut.

The earned income tax credit is a credit that goes to people who do not pay taxes. It is an assistance to the working poor, and we are told that we are cutting it when we go from $19.9 billion to $25 billion in the 7th year. That is an increase of 20 percent, and yet our colleagues call it a cut.

The School Lunch Program, which they went to schools and told the children they would no longer have a school lunch program. What an outrage. That program goes from $5.1 billion to $6.8 billion.

Our Student Loan Program, we are told we are cutting the Student Loan Program, and it goes from $24.5 billion to $36.4 million, a 50-percent increase in student loans. Only in Washington when you spend 50 percent more do people call it a cut.

And then, before yielding to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GANSKE], I will just make reference to two very important programs, I know to Mr. GANSKE, and certainly to me as well, because we worked on these programs very closely. Medicaid. This is health care for the poor. We go from $89 billion now to $127 billion. Only in Washington when you go from $89 billion to $127 billion do people call it a cut.

And then with Medicare, we go from $178 billion to $289 billion. I would love to just make reference to some very specific points in this program. The bottom line to this program is that when we talk about it, we are going to go on a per capita basis from $4,800, in this past year, to $7,100 in the year 2002, which is now 6 years from now.

Now, that is a 45-percent increase per capita, and yet I am told that is a cut. We are allowing Medicare to increase on an annual basis of 7.2 percent, and yet I am told by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that that is a cut.

I have a difficult time with that. It is not a cut, it is a significant increase. Admittedly, it is not a 10-percent growth, it is a 7.2-percent growth each and every year.

I know my colleague, who happens to be a doctor, is very near and dear to the concerns of Medicaid and Medicare. Medicaid is health care for the poor. And also Medicaid is nursing care for the elderly poor. Medicare, which is health care for the elderly and the disabled, these are two very important programs that we are trying to save. I would love at this time to yield to my colleague to discuss whatever he would like as it relates to these issues.

□ 2215

Mr. GANSKE. I thank my colleague from Connecticut. It is such a pleasure to share time with him, and we can have a civilized discussion. There has been so much hot rhetoric on the floor of Congress in the last few weeks that I think it will be important tonight to cover some areas and present the facts to the public and discuss these issues in a rational way.

I think we ought to spend a little bit of time on the so-called tax cuts for the rich. I think we ought to spend some time on some of the specific items in Medicare that were discussed by the previous discussants. But I think maybe we should just start with where are we at with this budget? Why do we have furloughed Government workers?

Well, it has been about I think 7 weeks since the President signed a continuing resolution in which he promised to present Congress with a balanced budget, one that balances in 7 years by honest numbers, Congressional Budget Office numbers. It was just a few years ago that the President, right here, told Congress that he felt that the Congressional Budget Office provided the most accurate estimates for economic growth. Well, why do we have Government employees that are not working or those who are working are not getting paid in some areas? It is basically the President has not kept his promise. He has not presented or brought to the table a balanced budget that balances in 7 years utilizing the Congressional Budget Office that he said he would do.

In return for our last continuing resolution, Congress said we will consider everything, we will put everything on the table, tax cuts, health care, education, whatever your priorities are. But I tell my constituents back home that this has been very frustrating, because it is like if I go to an auto dealer, and I see a car on the lot and I really like it, I want to purchase it from that auto dealer and I say I will you $10,000 for that car, and the auto dealer says it is not enough, and I say, well, how much do you want? And he will not tell me. He just says, spend more or pay more. You know, it is hard to make an agreement with that.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire, it was not in a DeSoto dealership, since I know that my friend drove around his district in a DeSoto automobile in the last campaign.

Mr. GANSKE. If I would help the budget negotiations, I would bring the DeSoto to Washington and drive it down to the White House.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right that there has been very clear confusion on this issue because we saw in November, on the 20th of November, a commitment made by the President that he would come forth with a balanced budget that would use what we describe as honest numbers in Washington lingo. It is the Congressional Budget Office scoring, and he said when he stood behind where my friend is in his first State of the Union Message on February 17, 1993 that he believed the most honest numbers and responsible scoring procedure was to utilize the Congressional Budget Office, and tragically, while that indication was made when it was signed by the President November 20, and we have failed to receive that balanced budget, it has understandably created a high level of frustration, not only for those who serve in the Congress, but for those Federal workers who have been furloughed and the American people who have been anticipating a response.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I think people back home get all mixed up when we are talking about CBO, Congressional Budget Office, or OMB, Office of Management and Budget. That is the administration's predictors of economics. But I try to explain it to them this way: you have to work from the same set of books using the same accounting system in order to understand where you are both at. You cannot use one type of accounting system and a different accounting system and come to an agreement. That is why it was so important and why I was hopeful for a period of time, when the President first agreed to doing this, that he would actually put his numbers there, that we would be comparing them apples to apples and not apples to oranges.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, that is the key point, that we compare the same basic accounting numbers. And Mr. DREIER is right on target, the President was right behind you saying use the Congressional Budget Office numbers. Congressional Budget Office is not bipartisan. It is not partisan, it is nonpartisan. These are not political appointees like the Office of Management and Budget.

Mr. GANSKE. The gentleman is on the Committee on the Budget, and he very well knows that when Congress passes budgets, we certainly did not get every economic prediction that we wanted to from the Congressional Budget Office.

Mr. SHAYS. Did we get any that we wanted?

Mr. GANSKE. We had to work with the assumptions that they gave us, just like we would expect the President to work with the CBO on their assumptions.

Mr. SHAYS. So it has been since November 20 and the President made it very clear that we would balance the budget using the Congressional Budget Office numbers. And what has happened since then? Has he submitted a budget? Has it been scored by the CBO? And the answer is no.

That is really the point that we find ourselves. We have been authors and we have authored since January and we have struggled and debated and made decisions on Medicare and Medicaid; on the school lunch program; yes, on taxes as well. We set out priorities, and now we want the President to tell us what his priorities are. Instead, he has been a critic on the sidelines saying what he does not like, and not an author, and we are asking him to be an author. The challenge we have right now is the Government shutdown. Why is it shut down?

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman would yield, I think we as Republicans made a mistake. The mistake that we made was in believing that when on November 20, 1995, just about 6 weeks ago when this agreement was signed, we believed that the President would come forward and, in fact, offer this balanced budget with the honest numbers, the Congressional Budget Office scoring. Our mistake was in believing that, because tragically it has not happened. That is what has created this high level of frustration.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield, the President signed that continuing resolution. That was an act and that is a law. He has broken his promise on that. Because the President has not kept his promise, I think it has really created a level of frustration and distrust with Congress at this point in time.

I believe that if the President really wanted to get the workers back to work, the most constructive step that he could take would be today—I mean, he has 500 workers in the Office of Management and Budget. He has had almost 2 months.

Mr. SHAYS. And you want him to do What?

Mr. GANSKE. I think if he would finally put a plan on the table that the CBO scored as balanced, it does not matter what is in it. He can put his priorities in it. It would be a sign of good faith with Congress, if the President is truly interested in doing this.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman would yield, I watched the President give his press conference yesterday and he said Republicans are trying to basically ram down our proposal, which is simply not true. Because we are not saying that he has to present our proposal. We

are saying he needs to present his proposal with his priorities.

For instance, if he wants no tax cut, he can submit a budget with no tax cut. If he wants more spending on Medicare or Medicaid, he can do that. The only requirement is that it be balanced, scored by real numbers. So, that is the issue and it is simply not true.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield, the gentleman has pointed out before that this is hard work coming up with a 3,000-page document, as this Congress did, that balances. We went through every program. We had to make some tough decisions when we did that. We have to decrease the rate of growth in some areas. And I believe that the reason the President has not done this is because he has not been willing to make some difficult decisions. It brings into question, truly, whether the President wants to balance the budget or has the moral courage or the spine to do that.

Mr. SHAYS. Ultimately, this Government is going to be shut down until the President doe his job and provides this Congress with his balanced budget. That is a fact. It is not something that either you or I like, but we know what the cause is. This is the cause that only happens and an opportunity that only happens once in a lifetime.

For over 30 years, particularly since the end of the Vietnam war, our national debt his gone up from over $300 billion to $4.9 trillion or $4,900 billion, and that has happened in peacetime. Both the gentleman from Iowa and I and other Members, particularly on this side of the aisle, want to put an end to that. We want to end the deficits so we have lower interest rates; so our mortgages cost us less; so our car payments cost us less; and so that businessmen and women, when they want to invest in new plant and equipment to make their workers more efficient and more productive, do not have to pay so much for the cost of money to invest in new plant and equipment.

What I would like to do is I would like to get into one particular issue to illustrate what we did during the last 11 months, and that was the whole issue of Medicare. We know that Medicare is going up from $178 billion to $289 billion. first off, we know that Medicare is going bankrupt. It becomes insolvent starting this year. Less money is put in the fund than goes out the first time ever in Medicare Part A.

We know it ultimately starts to go insolvent and becomes bankrupt in the seventh year. With our Medicare plan, we are looking to spend a considerable amount more in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7. We spent in the last 7 years $926 billion. We are looking to spend $1.6 trillion. $1.6 trillion. We are going to spend $727 billion more in the next 7 years than we did in the last 7.

On a per capita basis, we are going to go from $4,800 per beneficiary to $7,100. and it is important to say ''on per beneficiary,'' because people are saying ''You are getting more people in the system.'' Yes, even with more people in the system, we are still going to spend 45 percent more for each of those individuals.

Mr. GANSKE. That is more than twice the projected rate of inflation. But the importance of this matter is tremendous. As a physician who has treated Medicare patients, the facts are staggering. It is an absolute fact that in 6 years there will be insufficient revenues coming into the system to cover the bills.

Now, the Health Care Financing Administration has recognized this for a number of years. What they have done through a system of price controls is gradually tightened the tourniquet. They have tightened the tourniquet on rural hospitals, on providers, and even with their price controls, they have not been able to bring down the rate of growth because they have not addressed an essential issue of overutilization.

Now, President Clinton has proposed a smaller amount of savings from Medicare, from the Medicare Program, from what we proposed. When we originally proposed our Medicare bill, our savings were projected at $270 billion. In fact, tonight on the floor this was the figure that was mentioned. It would be much more accurate to say what the current levels are, because the Congressional Budget Office has readjusted their figures, and so we are now at a level of about $205 billion in savings.

Mr. SHAYS. But still allowing, if the gentleman would yield.

Mr. GANSKE. But still allowing 7.2 percent growth each year on the average. Remember when President Clinton and Mrs. Clinton presented their plan just a year and a half ago, they proposed an increase of about 6.8 percent. At that time they said that was not a cut. But now when we have proposed spending more than they did, now, of course, this is a Draconian cut. We have got to get past this Washington language about cuts. It confuses people back in the district.

Mr. SHAYS. I would like to just emphasize this point though. The bottom line is that the White House, when they were presenting their plan on Medicare, suggested that Medicare could only grow at 6.8 percent a year; that we needed to slow the growth. That is what we are doing. Admittedly, we failed to keep it as low as the White House originally suggested and it is going to grow at 7.2 percent.

□ 2230

And now we had basically four ways to make these savings generically. One is we could change and affect beneficiaries. The second is we could change and affect providers. The third is we could raise taxes to save the Medicare trust fund part A, and that simply was ruled not an option. And the fourth is we could change the system.

I would love to get into the whole issue of how we are looking to change the system, but first before yielding I will make this point: We did not advocate making any change in copayments. We did not advocate, and do not, any change in the deduction. We do not advocate changing the beneficiary rate, the premium rate on the Medicare part B. We leave that at 31.5 percent, with the taxpayers still paying 68.5 percent.

Now, Medicare part A, which is going bankrupt is the hospital payments. Medicare part B is the services. In Medicare part B, we keep the premium, the cost to the beneficiary, at 31.5 percent.

As health care costs go up, that 31.5 percent will continue to be a higher amount, much as it has been in the last 7 years. That will be that gradual increase.

I would love to later on, but I will yield to my colleague, I will just point out that in the year 2002 the President basically would have a premium of $82.80, at 25 percent of the cost, because the President fails to slow the growth of Medicare, and at 31 percent of the cost, our charge is only $87.50. It is less than $4 and some change, the difference in the premium cost, and yet the President has called this Draconian.

The bottom line is I would love my colleague to talk about what we have done. We have not increased the copayments. We have increased deductions. We keep the beneficiary rate at 31.5 percent.

Mr. GANSKE. I think, if the gentleman would yield, there has been a lot of confusion and sort of half-truths related to the premiums. It has been reported in my local paper that this is a bad plan because premiums would double. It is a half-truth, because what was neglected to be said was over 7 years. And how much would the premiums have increased if you had done nothing to the program? Because premiums have increased in Medicare 29 out of the last 30 years, and it is my understanding that premiums have increased $14 since President Clinton became President.

You know, health care costs do keep rising, and if a Medicare recipient is paying the same percent of his part B premium, then because there is a gradual rise, just as there is a rise in the Consumer Price Index, which will increase the Medicare beneficiaries' Social Security payments over 7 years from $700 to $935, then you have to tell the whole truth. And the gentleman is exactly right. I mean, how are these savings achieved? The only thing asked of Medicare beneficiaries was that they pay the same percent of their part B premium for the next 6 years that they paid last year, no increase in deductibles, no increase in copayments.

At the same time, hospitals were asked to take a reduction. Providers were asked to take a reduction, and they agreed to do that if there were some structural changes in the program.

If you only tightened the tourniquet like the Health Care Financing Administration has done for the last 15 years, then you reach a point where, instead of just stanching the blood flow, you cut off the blood supply completely, and you will end up with gangrene.

So what we needed were some structural changes to go along with a decreased rate of growth, something that would be reasonable. But it should be pointed out that no senior citizen is going to be asked to change their current policy. They can stay exactly in the same type of Medicare program that they are right now. If they want to, there will be some options for them.

Mr. SHAYS. I would make this point, it is not like the telephone company where you found you were with AT&T, the next moment you found yourself part of MCI or another telephone service. You will stay in Medicare, the traditional fee-for-service, the Blue Cross/Blue Shield model, the 1960's version that exists today; you will stay in that program unless you proactively decide to become part of another program. And I make this point, that you, as a Member of Congress and I as a Member of Congress, who are Federal employees and get Federal health care, we get choice, and we are saying to beneficiaries that they for the first time will have choice.

They will stay in the present system unless they get a getter choice, and the better choice is they may get eyeglass care, they may get dental care, they may have a health care plan that says their beneficiary cost will not be as high or that they will pay no copayment, they may get a rebate in the amount that they pay, and they will decide.

Now, let us just say they make a choice, and they did not like the service. We are allowing them for the next 24 months to go right back into that fee-for-service. So they sign up, they do not like it, they are not locked in for a year or 2 or 3. Now, after 24 months, when they make a choice, it will be on an annual basis as it is for me. As a Federal employee, once I choose a health care plan, of which I pay 28 percent, I am locked in for a year. Every year I can decide to get out at a certain point.

So we are offering choice, something that I know my constituents have asked for for a long time, but we are allowing them to stay.

I know my colleague has some more to add on this issue.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman will yield further, I am appreciative of the fact that you have brought up the issue of benefits that Medicare beneficiaries can receive, because in the current program, the way Medicare is right now, there is some real unfairness in the system. There is some real inequity. This particularly affects my home State of Iowa as well as some other rural States.

Let me explain what this is. There is such a thing as the AAPCC, the annual adjusted per capita cost. This is a funding formula that Medicare uses to determine how much they will provide for benefits per beneficiary, if, for instance, they are in a managed care plan.

Mr. SHAYS. Are you saying this is based on determining health care costs county by county by county?

Mr. GANSKE. County by county. Every county in the country has a rate determined by the Health Care Financing Administration, by Medicare. Unfortunately, the difference between some counties and other counties is huge.

Let me give you an example. This chart shows that the disparity between the top 10 percent of counties in this country and the bottom half of the counties will increase if nothing is done. For instance, in my congressional district, one county is reimbursed on a monthly basis per Medicare beneficiary at about $245. There are counties in this country where the reimbursement rate is over $700.

Mr. SHAYS. Particularly in urban areas?

Mr. GANSKE. Particularly in urban areas, and this is a situation where everyone in my counties are paying exactly the same Medicare tax as everyone in the other counties that are getting more than twice as much per beneficiary. That is why, for instance, in New York City, somebody can sign up for a plan, get eyeglasses, membership in a health fitness club or some other benefit or have their premium paid that they cannot get in Adair, IA.

Mr. SHAYS. Just to clarify, that is because that beneficiary basically has $600 that they bring to a plan on a monthly basis, whereas in a county like your own, a rural county or counties like your own, it may only be $200 or $300?

Mr. GANSKE. Exactly. And that has been a flawed funding formula based on over-utilization in certain areas.

Mr. SHAYS. So what did we do about it?

Mr. GANSKE. So our plan addresses that. Our plan immediately bumped the lower counties up.

Mr. SHAYS. If the gentleman, before leaving that, just put that chart that he just took off, my understanding is the average starts somewhere between $4,000 and $5,000 on an annual basis, and the bottom 50 percent are actually below $4,000, yet just the top 10 percent are $6,000 and climbing.

Mr. GANSKE. If we look at it on an annual basis the benefit that a Medicare beneficiary would get, for instance, in Nebraska or Iowa or Oregon, ti would be in this range, below $4,000 on an annual basis. In some parts of the country it is $6,000. The average is about $4,500.

But look at what happens over time as you go out to the year 2002. If nothing changes in Medicare, you can see that the difference between these two increases over time.

Let me just show you how this affects my particular State. The dark blue areas are counties that are more than 30 percent below the national average. Light blue is 20 to 30 percent. I practiced medicine for a while in the State of Oregon. Oregon has been very efficient in their health care. Look at the State of Oregon, for example; the whole western part of the State is reimbursed at levels 30 percent or more less than the average. Our plan addresses this inequity because it immediately bumps up the baseline, the minimum amount that any county could receive.

Some counties in Nebraska, for instance, receive $170 or $180 per month. That is immediately increased to $300, the next year to $350, and when you get that initial bump up to a minimum floor, then you have a differential rate of growth from those countries at the top compared to those at the bottom. The ones at the bottom will grow over the next 7 years at twice the rate as those at the top. So the ones at the top are still growing. They are still getting more each year, but the ones at the bottom are growing a little faster. And so what that means then is that over a period of time you narrow the difference between those counties that have very low reimbursement rates now and those that are very generous.

This is just one of the small details in the Medicare plan that we have passed that improves the system and will improve it for everyone across the country.

Mr. SHAYS. I would just make a point that in representing an urban area, it was hard for me to comprehend at first that there would be such a low reimbursement to rural areas, and as this gentleman and some of your colleagues from rural areas pointed out to those of us from urban areas, that we had to deal with this issue. I think we have made a very good-faith effort to try to deal with this inequity. That is one area that we looked at.

Another area I would love to focus in on before our time runs out is that health care fraud, which is pretty rampant, has been a State-by-State process. In our legislation, for the first time we make it a Federal offense to defraud both Medicare and Medicaid and CHAMPUS. CHAMPUS is the Federal program for our military and some other Federal employees. And for the first time we are making a concerted effort to deal with the State-by-State fraud and have a more greater team effort to go after this fraud.

I do not know if my colleague would like to speak to this issue as well.

Mr. GANSKE. One of the provisions in our plan says that if a Medicare beneficiary identifies an area of fraud or abuse, that they can participate in recovering some of the cost.

Mr. SHAYS. It is astounding when we find out what some of the fraud is. Some of it is perceived to be in a mistake where they were sent a $16 bill, it turned out to be $160 or $16,000, or a man being charged for giving birth to a

child, just things that were so preposterous, but not, frankly, all that uncommon.

Mr. GANSKE. One of the things that is currently happening in the Medicare Program is a trend toward increased utilization or increased opportunity for health maintenance organizations. This is happening. It is going to continue to happen, whether there is any change in the Medicare Program at all. But as the gentleman knows, we were aware of this, and we put in some significantly stronger patient and consumer protections in this bill in terms of notification, in terms of making sure that senior citizens cannot be taken advantage of by certain health plans.

I mean, there are a lot of good things in this bill, not the least of which has been discussed earlier this evening by the Members of the opposition party, related to medical savings accounts. This is one of those options that a senior citizen can use if he wants to. It is not for everybody. But it is something that is reasonable for people to think about. The way that it works is this: You receive a set amount of funds from which voucher you can then purchase a high deductible insurance plan. With the difference between what the plan costs, you can then put that amount into a savings account to pay the deductible. However, what you do not use stays and grows in that account, which is your account. And if you maintain a certain balance, then you can use that for additional medical provisions, if you want to.

□ 2245

Mr. SHAYS. If my colleague would yield, I have a number of constituents who manage their own care and manage their own health. They do not smoke, they may not drink, they try to lead healthy lives. They are a tremendous savings to our country because they are in fact healthier people.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield, those individuals who live healthy lives would then be able to purchase plans at less cost, because they would have less risk. Therefore, their healthy behavior is rewarded. That is part of personal responsibility. I think that this is something that is not for everyone, but I believe that what it does do is to reestablishes a connection between the payer and the recipient.

If somebody else pays for something, then you are never as concerned about what it costs. But if this is coming out of your account, you now have a personal financial interest in making sure that you are getting good value for your dollar, for your health care dollar. That means you are going to look at your bills.

For instance, that will mean if you are going to a family practitioner for a routine checkup, you may find that the family practitioner on one side of the street charges $20 for a visit, the family practitioner on the other side charges $25. If they give equivalent care, now you have a personal interest in being a good shopper.

I have had many Members of the opposition side say ''I don't think senior citizens can do that.'' It is sort of like they do not think senior citizens are capable.

Let me tell you, a lot of the senior citizens I know know exactly where the grocery bargains are. They are good shoppers. They have a network. They communicate with each other when they get together for coffee as to where is the best place to go. ''Did you know they are having a sale there?'' That kind of information will be spread around. I have confidence in senior citizens to be able to make wise decisions for themselves.

Mr. SHAYS. My colleague, what we have been talking about is one of the many plans that are part of our Balanced Budget Act which the President vetoed. We have some major differences with the President on Medicaid and on Medicare. He has some differences on whether or not to have tax cuts and where. We do not yet see his plan, and we are waiting for his plan.

But we have been very strongly criticized by some on the other side of the aisle that talk about a ''cut'' to Medicare. What we have talked about is the fact Medicare is going up from $4,800 per beneficiary to $7,200. We have talked about the fact there are no copayments, no deductions, the premium stays the same.

We are going to have a higher premium for the wealthier. The most affluent will pay more on Medicare Part B, something the colleagues on the other side of the aisle advocated, but now criticize. We are slowing the growth to a significant increase of 7.2 percent. Only when you spend 7.2 percent more each year do some, and only in this city, do they call it a cut.

Now we have talked about now a plan that has choice, yet you do not have to choose if you do not want. You can stay where you are. We have talked about the fact you have been trying for a number of years and have been critical, first when you were not part of Congress, to get us to address the fact that some counties do not get the kind of payment allotted for Medicare that they deserve to, and there is this extraordinary disparity, and the only way choice is ultimately going to work is increase what we do in rural areas. We dealt with that.

We have made significant changes to get at fraud, waste and abuse, and that we are allowing this choice for all our seniors.

So I am very proud of this program. I hope we do not change it much from what we have proposed. I believe we need to spend more on Medicaid than we have appropriated, but I think our Medicare numbers are pretty good. I hope when the President finally does his job and comes in with a budget, he recognizes that we have $12 trillion to spend in our overall budget in the next seven years. And it is an issue of how he wants to spend $12 trillion and how we want to spend it. If we do nothing, we will spend $13.3 trillion and continue to have deficits ad infinitum.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman will yield, let us put this on a common basis and tie this back in with senior citizens, because senior citizens have children and they have grandchildren. Their grandchild who is born today inherits $187,000 worth of debt, just interest payments in his lifetime.

The facts are staggering. A 21-year-old today faces a bill of interest payments of $115,000. Senior citizens tell me, look, we are willing to do our fair share, and it is a matter of what is fair when we look at this? But this is so important, because I agree with what you said earlier. We have a chance here to do something good for the country that does not come around very often. It may be our last chance to do this.

If this balanced budget work fails, then I think the message will be to Congresses not to try it. Do not take on a difficult job. Just kind of go along until we reach a crisis.

What we are really talking about now is the ability of a democracy to look ahead and see a problem coming, of knowing that this problem is coming. But it is not quite yet the crisis that throws all the economy into disarray, where it is not quite at the point where we would see 500 or 1,000 percent inflation in one year. But we can see that coming if we do not address this issue.

So the question is, can a democracy gather itself together, do something that is not easy, when you have not got your back totally against the wall like it is going to be in about 15 years?

Mr. SHAYS. Well, I know that you are a newer Member of Congress, and I know that you decided to run because you looked at how you saw Congress operate and said how can grown men and women fail to get our financial house in order? And that is what we are about.

I have had constituents who said to me, how could you shut down the government? Well, part of the government is shut down, and the reason it is shut down is that the President has vetoed some budgets that we have given him, that he has not given us a balanced budget, and we are determined basically for the long haul to seek a balanced budget. We are not going to miss this opportunity. We are going to pursue it.

I had some Members say to me, well, the polls say the President is taking the right position and Congress is taking the wrong position. It is interesting when we get in the polls. I will make two points.

One is that the Time Magazine, when they did a poll, said that just recently in the last edition, 47 percent feel we are ''cutting too much''; 46 percent said we were cutting just right on or not enough. When they learned in fact Medicare was going to grow per beneficiary 45 percent, that Medicaid was

going to grow significantly, that when they learned that the Earned Income Tax Credit goes from $19 to $25 billion, the school lunch from $5 to $6.8 billion, student loan from $24 to $36 billion, a 60 percent increase, Medicare from $178 to $289 billion, when they learned that; in other words, when the pollsters go back, they realize that there is a shift. And then two to one they say we are cutting just about right or not enough, when they realize in fact we are not doing the kind of cutting that they think we are doing.

I will just make this last point, if I could. I have been asked about the polls. I have answered it this way. If Abraham Lincoln during the height of our crisis in the battle between the North and the South on whether we would be one nation, under God, indivisible, if he had taken a poll and he has responded the way the press has asked us, how can you continue when the polls say this, when Abraham Lincoln was President, it was clear that most Americans did not support the war during the first few years. They wanted the way to end, and they wanted him to settle.

But he did not listen to the poll, thank God, because if he had, we would be not one Nation under God, indivisible; we would be two nations, and we would be very much divided.

So for me the polls ultimately will happen this November, and I can say, I am very willing to sink or swim on this issue, to live or die, to be reelected or not. I am willing to face what my constituents say. If they do not feel we need to balance this Federal budget and get our financial house in order and they disapprove of the way we are proceeding, then I am out of sync with the constituents I represent. Then I do not deserve to be reelected. But for me, this is something that comes from my heart and my mind. I believe in it with all my heart and soul, and I am very willing to live with the consequences, whatever the consequences may be.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, people ask me why is Congress being so strong on this? Many of my constituents say hold the line. They understand. But others say, ''Maybe a balanced budget is not so important.'' This is what I tell them. For the last 25 or 30 years, the average income family in this country has stagnated. I mean, you can talk to the President of the AFL–CIO. He will tell you exactly the same thing. Part of that is because in 1950, the average income family was sending 5 percent of their income to Washington for Federal taxes, and today the average income family is sending over 25 percent of their income. That means to Washington for Federal taxes alone. That is not counting State and local property taxes. So it means almost they have to work until July 4 before they can start to work for themselves each year. That is not the rich, that is an average income family.

So what we know will happen is that if we can balance the budget, when the government does not take so much of the discretionary income into itself, that leaves more out there. There are more jobs. We are talking about 5 to 6 million more new jobs in the next six years if we balance our budget. We are talking about interest rates dropping 1½ to 2 percent. For a young couple buying a $75,000 home, at 2 percent lower interest rates on their home, on their 30-year mortgage, they save $36,000. If a young person buys a car for $12,000 and their interest rates are 2 percent lower, they have just saved almost $1,000 on their car. That means if we balance the budget, family incomes will go up, there will be more jobs, the economy will grow. But let me just read to you what will happen if we do not balance the budget.

On November 2, this year, Alan Greenspan, the Federal Reserve Board Chairman said:

> If for some reason the political process fails and a balanced budget agreement is not reached, it would signal that the United States is not capable of putting its fiscal house in order, with serious adverse consequences for financial markets and economic growth.

Then he goes on to say:

> I think if you don't balance the budget, we would find that with mortgage rates higher and other related rates moving up, interest sensitive areas of the economy would begin to run into trouble.

Now, that is a remarkable statement for the Federal Reserve Board Chairman to make. That is about as strong a statement about what bad things will follow if we do not balance the budget as you will ever get from an economist.

Mr. SHAYS. And some people are not listening.

Mr. GANSKE. And some people are not listening.

Mr. SHAYS. I have had Mr. Greenspan come before my Committee on the Budget, and Mr. Greenspan was asked one time, do you think Congress will cut too much? And his answer was this: ''Mr. Congressman, I don't go to sleep at night fearful that when I wake up the next morning Congress will have cut too much.''

Given the battle that we have had with some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I understand his lack of concern on that issue.

But we know right now that interest rates have come down in the expectation that we will win this battle to balance our Federal budget and get our financial house in order. If we fail, there is no doubt in anyone's mind what the bond market will do, what the stock market will do, and ultimately what will happen to our economy.

Mr. GANSKE. Some people will say, oh, that is just economics. But those are economics that affect real people. I have a lot of farmers in my district. They run expensive farm operations. It costs a lot to run a farm these days. Most of them do not have the kind of capital to finance, so they have to take out loans to buy their seed, their fuel, to put in the crops. I will tell you, every farmer in my district understands very well the benefits that will accrue to them if we balance the budget, and they understand full well what the bottom line will be for them if we do not balance the budget.

Mr. SHAYS. Whether it is a farmer that has to invest in new facilities or new equipment for their farming or a businessman in some of the urban areas, or businesswoman in urban areas I represent, they look at the cost of money, and then they say ''If I build this new plant and equipment and hire these workers, will I get a return?'' The higher the interest rates, the less building of new plant and equipment you have and the purchase of new plant and equipment.

I know we have about 4 minutes left before we conclude. I would just like to reiterate the fact that we are looking to balance our Federal budget and get our financial house in order. We are looking to save our trust funds, particularly Medicare, from insolvency and ultimate bankruptcy. And the third thing we are looking to do is to transform our care-taking social and corporate welfare state into a caring opportunity society. This is our objective.

□ 2300

We are asking the President and hoping that he keeps his word to ultimately come in with a balanced budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office, using real numbers. We are not saying he has to agree to our tax cuts. We are not saying he has to agree to our Medicare Program, our Medicaid Program, or what we have done in discretionary spending or with food stamps or whatever else that we have set our priorities. We are saying to the President to set his priorities. Where we agree, then we can simply say there we agree; where we disagree, then we work out our differences.

I believe if the president were to submit a balanced budget, in a very short period of time we would come to an agreement. I know Mr. GANSKE, and I certainly know it for myself, we will not be happy with every part of that agreement, but we cannot be happy with every part of an agreement where we are compromising.

I think we need to ultimately find common ground. I know the gentleman has worked with other people, people on the other side of the aisle to find areas where we can agree. We are reaching out to our Democratic colleagues, because, clearly, we are Members of Congress. We are not Republicans first or Democrats first. We are Americans first, looking to get our financial house in order not in the short run but in the long run for the good of our children.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would continue to yield. Again I will bring this all the way around the circle back to the furloughed government workers. One thing should be known, and that is that, at least in my district, there is a

Federal credit union that is open and available to provide interest free loans to Federal employees if things are pretty tight.

I certainly would like to get my Federal employees back to work as soon as possible. I think that I will only speak for myself, I am not speaking for the Republican conference when I say this, but if the President would truly bring to the table a balanced budget, that is certified as balanced by the Congressional Budget Office, and if there are not any funny gimmicks in it, then I personally would consider that to be a good faith effort on the part of the President.

Mr. SHAYS. And so would I.

Mr. GANSKE. And I personally think that that would be the time then that we should bring the Federal employees back.

I think it should be noted, though, that I am not saying that the President has to agree with our plan. I am not saying we have to come to agreement on that. All that I personally would ask is that the President finally honor his commitment and bring a plan, his own plan to the table, so that we could get on with the job of comparing apples to apples and oranges to oranges in this budgetary process.

It is hard to make progress unless the President makes that first step and honors the signature he put on the line.

Mr. SHAYS. The commitment that the gentleman has made is one that I share. The President submits the balanced budget, scored by the Congressional Budget Office, using real numbers, not necessarily our numbers, his numbers, his priorities, and then we know that we can go to our conference in good conscience and say that we need a temporary continuing resolution.

I want to inquire of the Chair. I know we were given 55 minutes. We are prepared to speak a little longer or we are prepared to end our discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 6 more minutes unless the other party shows up.

Mr. SHAYS. I understand.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield back to my colleague.

Mr. GANSKE. And I would just like to point out some of the facts versus the myths that we have heard so much of over the last several weeks.

The first myth is this: Congress' budget is cutting Medicare spending.

Mr. SHAYS. Not.

Mr. GANSKE. What is the fact? What are the numbers in the last 7 years we spent? $926 billion. And we propose spending $1,600 billion in the next 7 years.

Mr. SHAYS. Sounds like a significant increase.

Mr. GANSKE. Myth: Congress' budget guts student loans. What is the fact? The fact is that in 1995 we spent $24 billion; in 1996 we spend $26 billion; in 1997, $28 billion; 1998, $30 billion; 1999, $32 billion; in the year 2000, $33 billion; the year 2001, $34 billion, and we end up spending $36 billion a year in the year 2002. Every year it increases.

Mr. SHAYS. And the total increase, if I might add, of 50 percent during that time. From $24 billion to $36 billion. Only in this city would someone call that a cut.

Mr. GANSKE. Let us talk about the next myth. The next myth is Congress' budget makes draconian cuts in welfare funding. I think I have heard that word draconian about a thousand times in the last 3 weeks. Well, how much did we spend on welfare in the last 7 years? We spent $492 billion. How much do we propose spending in the next 7 years? This will just flabbergast most of the viewers. We propose spending $838 billion.

Mr. SHAYS. I wonder if the gentleman could give me those numbers again? This is on welfare?

Mr. GANSKE. This is on welfare reform. Spending on welfare. And this is a combination of the welfare programs. And this is a combination of the welfare programs. In the last 7 years we spent $492 billion. We propose in our budget spending $878 billion. That is an increase, folks, of $386 billion in welfare spending.

Mr. SHAYS. Another myth?

Mr. GANSKE. If we go from 492 to 878, I do not know anyone in my district that calls that a decrease.

Mr. SHAYS. My colleague has pointed out a number of myths. We have presented our program. We are proud of our program. We are looking to the President to be an author and not just a critic.

We stand ready to work with the President and with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to have a true balanced budget.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would be more than happy to yield back the balance of our time.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question de novo of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

IMPACT OF BALANCING THE BUDGET ON THE LARGEST STATE OF THE UNION

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take just a few moments, as we prepare to file a rule, which will be considered here on the floor tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, to talk about a very important issue to me. I am privileged to represent one fifty-second of California. I am one of 52 members of the California congressional delegation, and I want to discuss the impact of our attempt to balance the budget on the largest State of the Union. It clearly would have an incredible impact.

It seems to me that we need to look at what balancing the Federal budget would do to the State of California. If the Federal budget is balanced in 7 years, $140 billion in debt, California's share of the $1.2 trillion in additional Federal borrowing, would not burden our future. Each of California's 11 million children will not see their share of the Federal debt increased by $13,000 over the next 7 years.

The balanced budget bonus of lower interest rates will create jobs, free local and State resources and increase the buying power of California families.

Now, Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, has stated on several occasions recently that the 2 percent drop that we have seen in interest rates is directly related to simply the discussion, the commitment and our quest for a balanced budget. Now, lower interest rates, and by the way, there is a direct line that can be drawn if one looks at election day 1994 downward, because this question for a balanced budget has led interest rates to drop further, and I am convinced that if we actually do put into place a balanced budget that we will see a further drop, and this has been predicted by many, of a percentage point or two.

Lower interest rates will create over that 7-year period 497,000 new private sector jobs in California. The cost of borrowing by the State of California will be reduced by over $3 billion, resources that could be used to address real needs in California, which would provide a benefit of $262 in a State tax cut per household.

Now, the point being that as interest rates drop, Mr. Speaker, we clearly would see a very beneficial impact in decreased interest burden paid by our State. The cost of borrowing by local governments within California will be reduced with the 12 largest cities in California seeing a savings of $1.38 billion alone, resources that, again, could be used for education, health care, and local law enforcement.

The average California family that owns a home will save $4,757 per year through lower mortgage interest rates, freeing family income to provide for themselves a higher standard of living. A California student, with the average college loan in our State of California, would save $858 over the life of a 10-year student loan, if we were to bring about a balanced budget with those lower interest rates which would follow.

California families will obviously pay less in Federal taxes. 6,138,000 California children live in families that are eligible for the $500 per child tax credit, if we put our package through. The Republican family tax relief will reduce the taxes of California families by $21.6 billion over the next 7 years, money

that is earned by parents and can be spent by the family.

Spending on priority social programs increases dramatically under our Balanced Budget Act. Total Federal spending in California would increase from $177 billion in fiscal year 1995 to $215 billion in 2002, an increase of 22 percent. Over the past 7 years, the Federal Government's spending in California was $1.11 trillion. Under the Republican balanced budget plan, total Federal spending in California will be $1.46 trillion, which is an increase of 31 percent.

Social Security payments to Californians will increase $15.9 billion over the next 7 years under our balanced budget plan, and Federal welfare spending, and that means food stamps, child care, cash welfare, child protection, school nutrition, SSI, the earned income tax credit in California, that will increase by $40 billion over the next 7 years under our plan.

Mr. Speaker, wasteful Washington mandates are lifted, giving flexibility to Sacramento and local governments to direct Federal and State resources to its highest priorities and to do this in the most efficient manner. Medicare payments to Californians, Mr. Speaker, will increase $9.2 billion over the next 7 years.

□ 2315

Medicare spending per senior will increase from $4,800 to $7,100 per beneficiary by the year 2002. California seniors will also be given a choice in the health care plan that they receive, rather than having their health care coverage dictated by Washington politicians and bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, Medicaid payments to California will increase by $3.4 billion over the next 7 years. The Federal Government would also reimburse to California hospitals swamped by illegal immigrants $1.6 billion of the cost of emergency health care services, which currently is a cost placed on California hospitals and the California taxpayers.

Lifting Washington mandates, increasing the cost of health care and diverting resources to lesser priorities, including mandates to provide health care to illegal immigrants and drug addicts, must be lifted as part of any plan to restrain the growth of Federal Medicaid spending in order to continue to provide equal health care to Californians who are in need.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, in closing, it is very clear that moving ahead with our Balanced Budget Act would, in fact, dramatically increase by 22 percent overall the level of spending for California over the next 7 years. So, we have not seen these Draconian cuts which many people have labeled our Balanced Budget Act as, and, in fact, we need to move ahead as expeditiously as possible because it is clearly a win/win for the people of California.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 2340

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) at 11 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTION TO DISPOSE OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 1643, MOST-FAVORED-NATION TREATMENT FOR BULGARIA

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104–447) on the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for consideration of a motion to dispose of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LIGHTFOOT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week, on account of his son's surgery.

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. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VOLKMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MORAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. THURMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MINGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NADLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SCHUMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. CARDIN, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HOYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PASTOR, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BUYER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HANSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MARTINI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FUNDERBURK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EWING, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCINNIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. BONO, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. HOLDEN.

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

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. TAUZIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. ENSIGN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BISHOP, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. BENTSEN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MALONEY, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. LAHOOD, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DELLUMS, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SAXTON, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mrs. CUBIN, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. WATT of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. ENGEL, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARCIA, for 5 minutes, today.
(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. DREIER, 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. MCNULTY) and to include extraneous matter:)
Mr. TORRICELLI.
Mr. HAMILTON.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. KLECZKA.
Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.
Mr. COYNE in three instances.
(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KINGSTON) and to include extraneous matter:)
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GANSKE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)
Mr. EDWARDS.
Mr. WALSH.
Mr. ROTH.
Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
Mrs. MALONEY.
Mr. STOKES.
Mr. HAYWORTH.
Mr. HINCHEY.
Mr. TORKILDSEN.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

H.R. 2203. An act to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on the following day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On January 3, 1996.

H.R. 2808. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Friday, January 5, 1996, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1907. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period April 1, 1995, through September 30, 1995, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1908. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the fiscal year 1993, operation and maintenance, Air National Guard, and fiscal year 1993, military personnel, Air National Guard, appropriations, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1909. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs and Public Liaison, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's second semiannual report to Congress, as required by section 403 of the Mexican Debt Disclosure Act of 1995, and the December monthly report to Congress, as required by section 404 of the same act, pursuant to Public Law 104–6, sections 403(a), 404(a) (109 Stat. 89, 90); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1910. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Department's report entitled, ''Annual Report on the State Energy Conservation Program for Calendar Year 1994,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6325; to the Committee on Commerce.

1911. A letter from the Director, Office of Administration, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the White House personnel report for the fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 3 U.S.C. 113; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1912. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–178, ''Prohibition on Abandoned Vehicles Amendment Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1913. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11–179, ''Woodrow Wilson Bridge and Tunnel Compact Authorization Act of 1995,'' pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1914. A letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1915. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1995, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

1916. A letter from the National Adjutant, the Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the report of the proceedings of the organization's 74th national convention, including their annual audit report of receipts and expenditures as of December 31, 1994, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 90i and 44 U.S.C. 1332 (H. Doc. No. 105–159); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed.

1917. A letter from the Librarian of Congress, Archivist of the United States, and the Public Printer, transmitting the final report on establishing a national policy on permanent papers, pursuant to Public Law 101–423, Section 3 (104 Stat. 913); jointly, to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight and House Oversight.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for consideration of a motion to dispose of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1643) to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria (Rept. 104–447). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. ROBERTS. Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2130. A bill to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to improve the efficiency and operation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation in order better to ensure that farmers, ranchers and rural home owners will have access to a stable and competitive supply of mortgage credit now and in the future; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services for a period ending not later than March 15, 1996, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(c), rule X (Rept. 104–446 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period not to exceed January 12, 1996.

DISCHARGED FROM CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Under clause 5 of Rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2685. Discharged from the Corrections Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of Rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1816. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than January 12, 1996.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LONGLEY:

H.R. 2842. A bill to provide for interest-free loans for furloughed Federal employees; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 2843. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to change the name of the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance Program to Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance, to authorize the termination of life insurance under that program when premiums are not paid, to provide for coverage under that program to be provided automatically at the maximum level unless the servicemember elects a lower level, and to make other improvements to life insurance programs administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MALONEY (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. MANTON):

H.R. 2844. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to authorize the President to issue loan guarantees for economic development and job creation activities in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois:

H.R. 2845. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to allow petitions to be submitted to prevent certain waste facilities from being constructed in environmentally disadvantaged communities; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COYNE:

H.R. 2846. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit for the cleanup of certain contaminated industrial sites and to allow the use of tax-exempt redevelopment bonds for such cleanup; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2847. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit the issuance of tax-exempt bonds for the economic development of distressed communities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCHUGH:

H.R. 2848. A bill to provide for compensation for Federal employees for emergency service performed during periods of lapsed appropriations; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 2849. A bill to establish the Hudson and Mohawk Rivers National Historical Park in the State of New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STUMP (for himself and Mr. MONTGOMERY) (both by request):

H.R. 2850. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the eligibility of certain minors for burial in national cemeteries; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.J. Res. 156. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for railroad retirement benefits for fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON:

H. Res. 331. Resolution to return a certain bill to the Senate; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. WYNN):

H. Res. 332. Resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to prohibit a House recess or adjournment during any period of lapsed appropriations for the Federal Government; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CONDIT (for himself, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. ORTON, and Ms. HARMAN):

H. Res. 333. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 2530, a bill to provide for deficit reduction and achieve a balanced budget by fiscal year 2002; to the Committee on Rules.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 528: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROSE, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MARTINI, and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 938: Mr. PARKER and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 1078: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1127: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 1161: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1202: Mr. FRAZER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VENTO, Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 1500: Mrs. KENNELLY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. BRYANT of Texas.

H.R. 1527: Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H.R. 1560: Mr. HILLIARD and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1610: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1684: Mr. YATES, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 1876: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2202: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 2223: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. SISISKY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2240: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2276: Mr. CANADY.

H.R. 2433: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2579: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, and Mr. FAZIO of California.

H.R. 2610: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 2651: Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 2658: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FOX, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. FRAZER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. UPTON, Ms. RIVERS, and Miss COLLINS of Michigan.

H.R. 2664: Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 2671: Mr. BAESLER, Ms. DANNER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. POSHARD.

H.R. 2677: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 2685: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2690: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.

H.R. 2707: Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2727: Mr. TALENT and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2828: Mr. METCALF, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROTH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MICA, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 2837: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HORN, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2841: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. SAXTON, Ms. MCCARTHY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.J. Res. 155: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. WISE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. HEFNER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. WARD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. NORTON, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. FARR.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H. Con. Res. 124: Mr. HOKE.

H. Res. 30: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 393: Mr. ZIMMER.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 104th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 142 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JANUARY 4, 1996 No. 2

Senate

(Legislative day of Wednesday, January 3, 1996)

The Senate met at 11 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Lord of our lives and Sovereign of our beloved Nation, we humbly confess our need for Your supernatural power. Thank You that You do not tailor our opportunities to our abilities, but rather give us wisdom, strength, and vision to match life's challenges. We surrender the pride of thinking that we can make it on our own resources. We are totally dependent on You. We could not think a thought, give dynamic leadership, or speak persuasively without Your constant and consistent blessing. You are the source of all we have and are. We praise You for the talents, education, and experience You have given us, but we know that You alone can provide the insight, innovation, and inspiration we need so urgently to meet the problems we face. You have told us there is no limit to what You will do to empower leaders who trust You completely, and give You the glory. We commit this day to glorify You in all that we say and do. In Your all-powerful name. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader, Senator DOLE, is recognized.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 153

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, first I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives from the House, House Joint Resolution 153, a funding resolution for the District of Columbia until January 25, 1996, that the joint resolution be deemed read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. I think it is clear that the effect of this will be to continue the District of Columbia government until January 25 at which time we hope we will have an agreement, or we will have some permanent resolution of appropriations bills and the D.C. appropriations bill. There is only one outstanding difference on that appropriations bill. It relates to vouchers. So, if that could be resolved, we could pass the District of Columbia bill.

SCHEDULE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, leaders' time has been reserved. There will be a period of morning business until 12 noon.

We are not expecting any rollcall votes to occur during today's session. I am not certain whether or not anything may come from the House. There is that possibility. But something may come from the House.

So I hope that maybe after Members have had any discussion they want, we might stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished minority leader is recognized.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the President pro tempore.

FUNDING FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I applaud the action taken this morning. I believe that providing the District of Columbia with the confidence of knowing that they will have the appropriate operating funds to continue at least through the 25th of January is very important. I talked to the Mayor this morning, and he urged that this be done. I am pleased that, again on a bipartisan basis, the Senate has agreed to take at least one of the many outstanding problems out of the mix and deal with it directly.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, while I agree that it is right to deal with the problems facing the District of Columbia, there should be no misunderstanding about the current situation. There are hundreds and hundreds of problems that are being created almost on a daily basis that have not been dealt with. Veterans are again in the same position they were prior to Christmas. If something is not done prior to the end of this month, veterans will not receive their disability checks.

If something is not done before the end of this month, AFDC recipients will not have their checks.

If something is not done before the end of this month, 260,000 Federal workers will have been out of work for an entire month. And the taxpayers are paying $40 million a day for this to occur.

How ironic can it be? The irony certainly must be apparent to every one of the people involved. How ironic that at the very time we are dealing with the budget, trying to find some resolution to the deficit, we are creating through this irresponsible Government shutdown a $40 million deficit unnecessarily each and every day. It is just outrageous.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

The Senate has, through leadership of the majority leader and colleagues on both sides of the aisle, come to terms with this. We passed the continuing resolution. That issue is over and done with.

What remains is for the House to act responsibly to do what they should have done weeks ago—to pass a continuing resolution, put people back to work, and make absolutely certain that this horrendous situation we face today is solved once and for all.

If we do not, there will continue to be dire consequences. Everyone should know that Meals on Wheels runs out of money this week. Senior citizens who may only receive one meal a day will cease receiving those meals as a result of the inaction in the House. Senior citizens will go hungry. No one ought to be confused about it. Everyone ought to understand the implications of what we are doing here. Seniors who may not get any other nutritional opportunities for the entire day will be denied this one meal as a result of House Republican intransigence.

Medicare contractors are no longer being paid. Medicare contractors are now being asked to go out and provide medical services without any compensation at all.

So are we affecting the lives and health of millions of Americans beyond Federal workers? Absolutely. We are doing it today.

I already mentioned veterans not receiving their disability benefits. They are not receiving educational benefits either.

Unemployment offices—we have people out of work, walking in for unemployment compensation, not knowing how they are going to pay their bills. Their situation is totally unrelated to any budget negotiations. They are walking into unemployment offices and finding that no one can provide them with service because 10 States have already been forced to shut down their unemployment offices. Ten States have shut down every single unemployment office

So people seeking help—not Federal employees, not people who may be part of the Federal Government but people who are out of work—are now being told there is nothing that we can do for them either.

Superfund has been halted now for cleanups in 32 toxic wastesites. There are 32 sites around the country completely shut down as a result of what has happened here in the Congress, and what is happening—or not happening—on the House side.

There are 20,000 student loans per day that are not being processed.

I had a call a couple of days ago from a friend in South Dakota whose daughter is depressed and in tears wondering just what is going to happen because she was told she cannot even go back to college because her student loan did not come through for the second semester. What happens to the next 6 months of her life?

Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk about furloughing Federal workers without pay. But it appears that the House may furlough themselves with pay. How outrageous can that be? What a contrast. What an incredible juxtaposition of fairness. The House is going out on a 2-week vacation with pay.

Every Federal worker is left at home without pay and the Federal taxpayer is left holding the bag each and every day for services not rendered.

This country has been in very difficult positions in the past. But I daresay, Mr. President, that this is the most inexplicable, outrageous situation that I have seen since coming to the Senate. It has to end. The House has to come to grips with taking the responsibility and doing the right thing. It has to happen, and it better happen today.

I yield the floor.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENS). For the information of the Senate, under the previous order, House Joint Resolution 153, which was just received from the House, has been deemed read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider has been laid upon the table.

So the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 153) was deemed read a third time and passed.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business for not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon with Senators permitted to speak therein for not to exceed 10 minutes.

COMMEMORATION OF UTAH'S CENTENNIAL

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, 100 years ago today, Utah became the 45th State of the Union. I wish to join with Utahns everywhere and celebrate this momentous day, as I am sure my colleagues would as well, and I extend my best wishes for the next century.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, 100 years ago today, January 4, 1896, President Grover Cleveland signed a proclamation admitting Utah as the 45th State of the Union. I rise in recognition of this event and to join with Utahns everywhere to celebrate the centennial of the State of Utah.

Prior to President Cleveland's action, Utahns had diligently battled for more than half a century to attain this goal. The telegram announcing Utah's statehood arrived at 9:13 a.m. on that winter morning in January at the Western Union office located on Main Street in Salt Lake City. As gunshots rang out the news, hundreds of people began shouting with joy, ''Statehood has been proclaimed.'' Bells and whistles reverberated throughout the valley, and one-by-one, 100 American flags were hoisted.

President Cleveland actually signed the proclamation at 10:03 a.m. in Washington, DC. His private secretary, Mr. Thurber, was quoted in the Salt Lake Tribune as saying,

> The President looked upon the signing of the proclamation as purely as Executive act, and one not, therefore, to be witnessed by the public any more than the affixing of his signature to other routine business which came before him.

Let me emphatically state 100 years later than President Cleveland's act was not just routine business—this was the birth of a truly remarkable State.

Utah is great because its people make it so. Utahns, regardless of religious affiliation, hold solid values in common that I believe are essential to the quality of life anywhere. These include a strong work ethic, honesty, charity, compassion, thrift, perseverance, and respect for the family. There is a positive can do attitude in our State that is irresistible and refreshing.

As our State motto indicates, Utah is industrious. As we excel in the arts and humanities, we also excel in the sciences and in commerce. This success has brought us an enviable level of prosperity compared to other States, and sets the stage for a stable future for our children.

Utah's natural beauty is unsurpassed. The State of Utah has as a lasting and historical landmark, the Great Salt Lake; the greatest snow on Earth; and everything to offer in pure natural beauty. We are surrounded by the majesty of our mountains and forests; the breathtaking beauty of our red rock canyons; and the wide, open, limitless expanse of our farmlands and deserts.

People have come to Utah from every part of the world with one basic motivation—the belief that this is the place where they would find the opportunity to pursue their hopes and dreams. Utah's history is filled with tales of people who have displayed remarkable determination and the will to forge ahead regardless of the odds. Our history and our people have literally made a desert blossom. Utah leaves an indelible impression upon its citizens, its visitors, and its leaders. The Utah values and the people who believe in them are the reasons Utah is a wonderful place to live, work, and most importantly raise our families.

Mr. President, most of my colleagues have had the opportunity to visit Utah and experience the spirit that makes our State what it is today. As many have told me, they can fully understand why I am so proud to represent Utah in this body. I choose to bring this highly important date to the attention of the Senate in the hope that my colleagues will join with me in congratulating all Utahns for a job well done.

I want to publicly recognize all of the citizens of the great State of Utah and sincerely thank them for making Utah the wonderful place that it is today. I am honored to represent the people of Utah, and I hope and pray that the next 100 years will be successful and peaceful for all those who dwell within Utah's borders. Happy 100th birthday Utah.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I rise today to bring to the attention of the Senate the current celebration which is ongoing in my home State of Utah. With the beginning of this new year, Utah begins its centennial celebration having been admitted to the Union of States in 1896.

This 100-year mark is very significant considering the long struggle for the citizens of the Utah Territory to gain statehood in the late 19th century. The people of the Utah Territory tried unsuccessfully for admission to the Union six times—1849, 1856, 1862, 1872, 1882, and 1887—before being admitted in 1896.

Today, Utah is one of the fastest growing States in the country. Business is thriving as more and more companies establish roots in the State. The banking and financial industry have a long history of success in Utah. Manufacturing industry continues to grow and succeed. Utah's software industry is growing so rapidly that it has now surpassed that of Silicon Valley. Utah provides many opportunities for the families that reside in the State. With six 4-year, degree-granting universities and colleges, including four State institutions and two private institutions, Utah provides its citizens with many opportunities to enhance their education and circumstances. Today, Utah is ranked among the stop States in the Nation for the quality of its graduates.

Again, Mr. President, it brings me great pleasure to join with the people of my State in celebrating during this centennial year. I would like to pay tribute to the many people who have worked so hard to put together the events that are taking place this week and throughout the remainder of this year. In particular I would like to single out Mr. Steve Studdert for the fine job he has done as chairman of the Utah Centennial Commission. Additionally, thanks goes to Gov. Mike Leavitt and his many predecessors who have worked so hard over the past 100 years to make Utah what it is today. Of course we cannot forget our pioneer founders who saw the vision of what the desert could yield and put forth the hard work to cultivate and culture the Rocky Mountain valleys we now call home.

For Utahns who find themselves transplanted to Washington, DC, I would like to announce that a celebration will be held here on the 27th of January, commemorating Utah's centennial. My staff and I can be contacted for further details.

BUDGET STALEMATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know that this is a Presidential election year. We are going to have a hotly debated and contested Presidential election. But it is going to be on issues that are important, as indicated by the action taken by the majority leader day before yesterday.

I commend and applaud publicly the action of the majority leader in allowing the Senate to pass a clean continuing resolution. I say that because the issue of allowing the Federal workers to go to work is important. It is important to more than just the Federal workers. Therefore, I think it is important we talk about procedure so that people understand a little bit better what is going on.

The House of Representatives yesterday refused to allow to come to a vote—they refused to allow the continuing resolution that has passed the Senate to come before the House to be voted upon. They did that, the leadership in the House refused to let it come forward, because they knew if it came forward, it would pass.

That, to me, is a cowardly act. Why would they not let people stand in the light of day and cast their vote as to whether or not this Government could continue to function? They refused to do it because they knew if they brought it up for a vote, it would pass.

There are some in the House who think they are hurting what they hate; namely, the Federal Government, but they are hurting a lot more than just the Federal Government. Look at any newspaper, wherever it might be, in the United States today, and you will find the same stories.

I think the most illustrative appears in today's USA Today. In today's USA Today, Bangladesh, if not the poorest, one of the poorest countries in the world, is going to loan money to the United States to keep the Embassy open in Bangladesh. How embarrassing.

In Bangladesh, one of the world's poorest countries, the government has offered a loan [to the United States] to keep lights on at the United States embassy in Dhaka.

It is hurting more than Federal workers. Alabama ran out of Federal unemployment money, as did many other States.

U.S. embassies around the world are being forced to beg for credit.

You have businesses and governments throughout the world saying the United States cannot pay, will you give us some credit.

In Miami—

This same newspaper reports—

fishing guide Mike Haines has lost $3,000 in the past 2 weeks. Haines takes people on fishing trips in Everglades National Park which shut down December 20.

Now, 2 months after fulfilling his boyhood dream of being a full-time fishing guide, Haines is scrambling to make ends meet.

The Federal court system, including the Supreme Court, is running out of funds. It has tapped into a $120 million emergency fund drawn from fees collected by the courts.

They are going to run out of money on the 7th. That is Saturday, or Sunday. The Federal courts are going to run out of money.

About 15,000 employees of Government contractors are temporarily out of work.

On television last night in the news it was very, very graphic—people with uniforms, protective uniforms, faces covered, every part of their body covered, working in toxic waste dumps, being laid off.

The L.A. Times—this is not something just within the beltway. It is all over the country. The L.A. Times:

Shutdown Begins To Hit Home Across the United States.

The effects of the shutdown have spread gradually during the holidays, customarily a slow time in the public and private sectors, but this week the pace quickened and the closure is being felt in everything from restaurants and tourist businesses to toxic waste cleanup.

National parks, Mr. President, according to the New York Times, average 383,000 visitors a day. They are closed; a potential loss to businesses of $200 million a day. That $200 million goes to people's wages. Those people can buy cars. This, Mr. President, is an economic disaster based upon an unwillingness of a certain small group of people in the other body to allow an up-or-down vote on whether or not the CR should continue. Of course, it should continue.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for just a moment?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I wish to add one further example. In Mariposa County, CA——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has the floor.

Mr. REID. I yield to him. He wanted to ask me a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Do so through the Chair, please.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I will be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SARBANES. I thought that was the question that had been put earlier, I say to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No.

Mr. SARBANES. Is the Senator aware that apparently,

In Mariposa County, CA, home of Yosemite National Park, which has been closed through one of the busiest times of the year, the number of private sector layoffs has climbed to over 1,600 people. Most are hotel, restaurant, and gas station workers who usually can depend on the revenue they collect during the holiday season to carry them until the summer. One-fourth of the adults in that county are out of work. Officials there have declared an economic emergency.

I say, is this not yet another example of the kind of harm that is being felt across the country as a consequence of this closure of the Government?

Mr. REID. I would respond to my friend's question that the answer is yes. Even in Reno, NV, northern Nevada, why, we have significant numbers of people coming from California

all the time, and they many times do continue when they are visiting Yosemite, which is so close to Nevada. That has been lost.

This is felt by not only Federal workers; this is felt by non-Federal workers, and it is really reverberating throughout the entire United States. And I also respond to my friend that it is going to get worse, as indicated in these newspapers about which I was talking.

The L.A. Times goes on to say that ''at the other end of the economic spectrum''—they are talking about people. The reason they say this is, unemployment compensation checks, as indicated by the minority leader, are not being sent out in a number of States, but at the other end of the economic spectrum, many businesses are unable to obtain needed export licenses or are being left with no way to obtain required Federal approval of special imports or other transactions.

That is jobs. It is fancy talk, but it means jobs.

Also, the Securities and Exchange Commission cannot approve various offerings that have been made. Why is that important? It is important because each time a new company, a new stock offering is made, people are hired, put to work. They are simply not being put to work, all because a few people in the other body refuse—the leadership led by the Speaker of the House of Representatives refuses to allow that issue to come to a vote.

I see in the Chamber my friend from the State of Virginia. One of his fellow Members of Congress, Congressman DAVIS, with whom I am not personally familiar but someone I have followed, he publicly, a Republican, spoke out yesterday saying let us at least have a vote on the House floor as to whether or not a continuing resolution should pass.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. I would be happy to yield for a question.

Mr. WARNER. I just left, Mr. President, Congressman DAVIS' office. The delegation here in the greater metropolitan area, Congressman DAVIS, myself, Congresswoman MORELLA, who represents Montgomery County, and Congressman WOLF, and we were joined by Congressman BATEMAN, who represents the Tidewater district of Virginia, all met this morning, as we have been regularly meeting on this.

I wish to inform my distinguished colleague that Congressman DAVIS and the entire group this morning unanimously are going to do everything they can to oppose the House of Representatives going into recess tonight, as contemplated for a period to extend perhaps until the State of the Union Address around the 22d or 23d of January, while these employees are out of work.

I shall on my own time—and perhaps these statements could be charged to time I will eventually seek—talk about the ripple effect here in northern Virginia. So I thank my distinguished colleague from Nevada for mentioning Congressman DAVIS. I said yesterday publicly he and other Republicans in the House of Representatives from this area indeed deserve a great deal of personal credit for their courage in this situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is going to add 2 minutes to the time of the Senator from Nevada because of the statement from the Senator from Virginia. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes. His first 10 minutes has expired.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I think we should recognize that this should be a bipartisan resolution of the problems we have facing this Government. I have not been a party to the talks with the President, the two leaders from the House and the Senate. I hope they are progressing, but they are very difficult. We know that.

There are 80 different issues that are issues dealing with public policy that they have to work out. There has been an agreement on both sides that there should be a balanced budget, there should be a balanced budget within 7 years. They will use CBO figures. That has been stated publicly. That is not a secret. But in the meantime, let the Government go forward and go back to work, as it should.

I also say there are a few people—the House leadership is holding up the ability to vote on a CR. What are they afraid of? They are afraid of the fact that if this comes up for a vote before the House of Representatives, it would pass. I understand that in the House of Representatives yesterday in a secret meeting that they had, a Republican conference or caucus, 54 Republicans there voted to have this brought to the floor. It would pass. Clearly it would pass.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Chair would state under the previous order morning business would not extend beyond the hour of 12 o'clock.

Mr. REID. I ask for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. REID. I say that Mr. President, because I have been interrupted a couple times.

Mr. President, the Los Angeles Times:

> . . . budget analysts warned Wednesday that if the standoff continues for even a few more days, the impact will spread to larger and larger slices of the American economy and stopgap solutions will be more difficult to achieve.
>
> Several federal agencies reported that they have begun to halt contracts with private companies that provide supplies or services for federal programs. The White House Office of Management and Budget said [that] no overall estimates are available, [but they are strong].

It is the same in other newspapers.

The New York Times talks about the real problems that face this Government.

Mortgages. Work has halted on an estimated 200 million mortgages a day on mortgage loan processing for American people.

Veterans' Administration. That 170,000 veterans are not going to receive their benefits.

Mr. President, I say that this has gotten out of hand. This is not fair to the Federal workers, but more importantly it is not fair to a wide segment of the American population. This has got to stop. It is folly. I say, let those people come forward and allow an up-or-down vote in the House of Representatives. Speaker GINGRICH should allow an up-or-down vote if he believes in the democratic process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

THE PRESIDENT'S VETO OF THE INTERIOR BILL

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the President vetoed the Interior bill December 18. We are not here to try and reopen the debate in terms of what has taken place in the past, but I must say that this action by the President of vetoing the bills that were passed in the Congress just simply cannot help but to worsen the situation.

This particular bill, of course, embraces so many of our national parks and other places that people come from all over the world to visit, as well as our own citizens. This has been a point of very significant contention, the fact that people who have planned for a long time to visit these sites and many others cannot do so as a consequence of this deadlocked situation between the Congress and the President.

ENDING THE BUDGET STALEMATE

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I join all those who wish the President and indeed the leadership of both the House and the Senate to get these talks to reach a point where we can have a reconciliation of this problem. We have finally, after some months, focused the country's attention on the need for a balanced budget. And that is the centerpiece of this controversy. But I feel that this shutdown is taking the public attention away from that important and historic landmark achievement by the leadership of both the Senate and the House, and others; that is, bringing a final agreement on a balanced budget within a 7-year period of time.

If the President would be forthcoming, if he would be forthcoming with a balanced budget, with his own ideas as to how he can achieve it within that 7-year period of time with the CBO figures, I think these negotiations could very quickly resolve such differences that remain and allow the current stalemate to be concluded.

Mr. President, earlier I spoke about the meeting on the House side this

morning with Virginia Representatives DAVIS, WOLF, BATEMAN, Congresswoman MORELLA, who represents Montgomery County, MD, and myself. We meet regularly throughout each day. But this morning we reported as a group first that in our own metropolitan area the SAIC Corp., private contractors, furloughed some 600 people. DynCorp, another private contractor, has furloughed 700 people.

We had the transportation representatives in to see us this morning, primarily the taxicab operators in northern Virginia. Their business is absolutely devastated. Yesterday we met with those of the hotel industry and the restaurant industry. Their business is being devastated.

So the ripple effect, Mr. President, is impacting the greater metropolitan area, and indeed in many other places throughout the United States. It is imperative that all of us bring to bear our best judgment to try and resolve this problem.

Mr. President, I wish to include in today's RECORD just samples of the thousands of communications being forwarded to my office, both by telephone and by letter. I am certain that this is taking place in other offices here in the Senate. As a matter of fact, Congressman BATEMAN said he cannot even get through to his office in Tidewater, VA, today because of the volume of communications from his constituents.

But one letter dated December 12 of last year from a retired Navy captain, signed both by himself and his wife, simply says:

> Our country is already in a sorry state due primarily to congressional incompetence over the years, and these situations only make matters worse. Perhaps one answer to the ''stalemate'' problem might be to exclude the media from all deliberations and eliminate press conferences.

This is sort of the typical reaction of an individual who has dedicated his life as a public servant here in the military to try and keep our Nation strong but expressing his own views.

A second letter, December 29, 1995, from Mr. John Fulton of Vienna, VA, indicates he is a lifelong Republican, but he says:

> There is no rational reason why the issue of ongoing day to day operations of our government cannot be separated from the larger, and critically important, budget deficit problems.

I certainly agree with these constituents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIRGINIA BEACH, VA,
December 12, 1995.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I am a retired naval officer, having served forty years in the Navy, and my wife a homemaker for fifty-four years are most concerned with the political shenanigans now going on in Washington. While you are not directly involved the respective parties leadership must stop this nonsensical attempts to outwit the other side for political gain. It is time for your colleagues to put aside their egos and do the work Congress was elected to do, and within the framework of the Constitution.

Our country is already in a sorry state due primarily to congressional incompetence over the years, and these situations only make matters worse. Perhaps one answer to the ''stalemate'' problem might be to exclude the media from all deliberations and eliminate press conferences. In any event, you and your colleagues must get your act together, for the good of our country.

Having said the above we, like most of your senior citizen constituents, only ask that in your deliberations and voting that we be treated equally and fairly.

Sincerely,

T.H. CONAWAY, Jr.
MARGARET P. CONAWAY

VIENNA, VA,
December 29, 1995.

Hon. JOHN W. WARNER,
U.S. Senate, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARNER: I am writing to express my concern and dismay over the way in which this congress is conducting the work of the Nation.

As a lifelong Republican, I am embarrassed and appalled at the recent actions taken by members of our party which have resulted in a partial shutdown of government operations, financial problems for thousands of federal employees and private contractors, cost to the nation of millions of dollars in federal funds wasted daily and gross inconvenience to our citizens nationwide. The lack of mature leadership and responsibility demonstrated by Republican members of both the House and Senate in this situation is without historical precedence in the 44 years that I have been privileged to be a party member and vote!! It would appear that a significant number of congressional members have forgotten a fundamental principle of our Democracy—the ends don't justify the means! If this behavior continues there will be no need for term limits.

There is no rational reason why the issue of ongoing day to day operations of our government cannot be separated from the larger, and critically important, budget deficit problems. We must separate these issues; get the government and related businesses back to work and focus on the central issue before the Nation—the re-prioritization of our national goals, priorities, programs and commitments necessary to balance our budget and relieve our children and grandchildren of the horrendous 4 trillion dollar debt. If the congress and administration are unable to resolve this issue before the next election then let the voters decide who they want to entrust the challenge to.

I am also greatly concerned about the proposed capital gains tax cuts and child tax credits. If our party is serious about deficit reduction and restoring our Nation's fiscal health and credibility we should recruit all Americans to share in the sacrifice—sustain the cuts, drop all tax cuts and apply all the savings toward the $4,000,000,000,000 + deficit! Any other course of action will be correctly viewed by the American people as a sham, catering to wealthy-special interest groups and we will (and should) pay at election time. This is a year when those of us who have profited greatly from stocks/bonds investments should be willing to make a continued investment in the Nation which made those earnings possible—through capital gains and other revenues. When we get our nation out of debt we can cut taxes—and all celebrate!

I appreciate your leadership and wish you and your staff a blessed and prosperous New Year.

Sincerely,

JOHN FULTON.

Mr. WARNER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico seek the floor?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Yes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 10 minutes.

LIVELIHOODS DISRUPTED

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I wanted to comment on two major items today. First—this is a somewhat new item. I believe it is a new example of the abrogation of responsibility by the House Republican leadership. For 20 days we have been holding three-quarters of a million Federal civil servants hostage in this effort to exercise what Speaker GINGRICH calls his right not to pass spending bills.

He has referred to that many times in interviews. As a result, as the Senator from Virginia was just pointing out, many Americans—contract workers, those planning to travel, those seeking export licenses, those seeking federally insured mortgages—have had their livelihoods disrupted.

Now the leadership in the House has added the military personnel of the country to the list of those whose livelihoods are being disrupted.

Yesterday, the House failed to override the President's veto of the Defense authorization bill. And when they did that, Congressman DELLUMS sought to bring up S. 1514, which is a bill that the Senate passed last Saturday to ensure that our troops get their full January pay raise, both their basic pay and subsistence pay, which are to increase 2.4 percent, and their quarters pay, which is to increase 5.2 percent.

When the Senate passed the bill last Saturday, the Presiding Officer, Senator STEVENS, made the statement: ''Mr. President, this bill should not be controversial. The President asked that it be passed and has said that he will sign it as soon as he receives it.''

Congressman DELLUMS yesterday tried to bring it up in time so that the Pentagon could ensure that troops receive their full pay in their first January paycheck. He was refused.

Mr. President, when we have troops in Bosnia and when our troops are proudly around the globe in other potential hot spots—South Korea, the Middle East—the House Republicans should not be adding them to the list of people who are being inconvenienced and whose livelihoods are being disrupted by inaction in Congress. This is yet another example of where Senate Republicans have acted responsibly in carrying out their duties under the Constitution; House Republicans have not. The Senate acted last Saturday on the Stevens-Thurmond bill as soon as the President vetoed the Defense authorization bill. I am sure many Senate

Republicans do not agree with the President's veto of that Defense authorization bill, but they were not going to allow their differences with the President on that larger issue to adversely affect our troops.

Mr. President, I can only hope that the House Republican leadership will reverse course today. Their refusal to take up and to pass that military pay bill yesterday was inexcusable. I hope they will do our military personnel and all Americans a service by bringing it up and passing it today.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE SECOND SESSION OF THIS CONGRESS

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, let me speak about one other issue that I am quite concerned about, and that is the implication of what is going on now for the work of this Congress in the second session and in future sessions. There has been a lot of talk about hostage-taking. There was a very good editorial that has been referred to in the Washington Post yesterday about how the current shutdown is an example of hostage-taking. Yet, the editorial stated, I thought, very eloquently:

> Hostage-taking is an ugly business. It doesn't matter what the cause. Innocent people are seized and used as pawns; they become political trading stamps whose welfare is exchanged for things the hostage-taker could not win by normal means.

Obviously, the most dramatic example of hostage-taking in recent history in this country was the hostage-taking in Iran in November 1979. It could be debated whether the current Government shutdown rises to the level of a hostage-taking. Perhaps this is just a using of public servants, Federal employees, as pawns in a larger political game, and I will leave to others the debate about whether this is, in fact, a hostage-taking.

But, Mr. President, in my view, when each of us took our oath of office, and that oath included the duty to protect and defend the Constitution, implied in that was the responsibility to maintain a functioning Government. Now, that is not written into the Constitution, but I think it is clearly implied that those of us who seek public office will take on that responsibility.

We can argue about what the Government ought to do, we can argue about how large the Government ought to be, we can argue about how many employees ought to be hired by the Federal Government, but the basic responsibility to maintain a functioning Government is something about which I think is very difficult for us to argue.

The Republican leadership in the House has taken a different view. They are saying that as to the parts of the Government which today remain closed, they do not share that responsibility to maintain those parts of the Government functioning. They believe that is the President's problem, it is not their problem.

Those who wrote our Constitution established a system of government where power is shared, but also a system of government where responsibility is shared, and part of that responsibility that is shared is the responsibility to maintain a functioning Government.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BINGAMAN. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. I say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, given our constitutional arrangements of separation of powers and checks and balances, if both branches do not act responsibly, how can we meet our responsibilities under the Constitution?

We have a situation here, as I perceive it, in which a coercive tactic is being employed which I understand has never been used previously in our Nation's history. That is, a certain group, in order to get its way on a substantive issue, is prepared to use as a tactic the closing down of the Government with all of the harm that inflicts, not only on the Federal employees but throughout the private sector.

This is a classic example of using any means to get to your end, even though the means that are being used here result in a breakdown of our constitutional system of democratic government. What is the Senator's perception with respect to that?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the question very much, and I agree entirely with what the Senator from Maryland is saying. I believe it is a breakdown of our system. I believe the Founding Fathers who set up our system of government intended that all of us in Government, whether in the legislative branch or in the executive branch, would work together to try to maintain a functioning Government and to resolve disputes. That is not happening now.

I was particularly bothered by an article on December 2 in the Washington Post where it talked about the impasse that was existing, and it referred to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in the House, Mr. LIVINGSTON. It said:

> Livingston and other Republicans yesterday boasted that after weeks of standoff over spending issues, the momentum had shifted in the Republicans' direction when the President accepted the defense spending bill. ''I think that once the defense bill was off the table, the administration lost the leverage it really had planned on using,'' Livingston said. He added that most of the remaining spending bills include programs that ''are a greater concern to the President'' than to many other Members of Congress.

To me, that does not bode well for the rest of our deliberations in the second session of the Congress. If the President needed to keep the Defense appropriations bill on the table in order to be able to bargain with the House, then the obvious message is that he would keep it on the table in a new session. I cannot conceive of the President this fall, for example, when we send him appropriations bills, I cannot conceive of him signing a legislative appropriations bill before all of the executive branch appropriations bills have been completed. It would not make any sense, if this is the new context in which we operate.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BINGAMAN. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. Representative BOEHLERT stated in mid-November, and I quote him: ''You have a group in our conference who could not care less if the Government shuts down. They will be cheering.''

I submit, shutting the Government down is a default in carrying out your responsibilities as an elected Member of the legislative branch. You have to separate out the matter of carrying forward the normal functions of Government, on which millions of people across the country depend, from disputes you may be having over particular issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

REGARDING THE RESOLUTION COMMENDING BRETT FAVRE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate passed, at my request, a resolution commending Brett Favre, from my State, who was named earlier this week as the most valuable player in the National Football League. Brett, as Senators know, is the quarterback of the Green Bay Packers.

When I introduced the resolution, I did so on my behalf and TRENT LOTT, as a cosponsor. I learned, after adopting the resolution, that the two distinguished Senators from Wisconsin wanted their names to be added as cosponsors of the resolution. I looked at the RECORD and it does reflect that later in the RECORD. I wanted to make a point of saying that I had not received that information at the time the resolution was submitted and passed by the Senate.

I was going to ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senators HERB KOHL and RUSS FEINGOLD be added as cosponsors, but that is reflected in the RECORD. So I am pleased that they joined us in the resolution commending and congratulating Brett Favre for the great honor that he received.

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONGRATULATING BRETT FAVRE

• Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today with my colleagues, Senators

RUSS FEINGOLD, THAD COCHRAN, and TRENT LOTT, to congratulate Green Bay Packers' quarterback, and Kiln, MS, native Brett Favre for winning the 1995 National Football League Most Valuable Player Award.

After leading the Green Bay Packers to their first National Football Conference [NFC] Central Division title since 1972, Brett Favre ran away with the National Football League Most Valuable Player voting, capturing 69 votes from a nationwide panel of 88 sports writers and broadcasters. Favre's numbers speak for themselves, as he threw an NFC record 38 touchdown passes for over 4,400 yards passing. This would be considered an amazing accomplishment for any quarterback; however, couple it with nagging injuries over a 17-week season, and you've described the iron-willed ''Leader of the Pack,'' Brett Favre.

Brett Favre has emerged as a true star in the National Football League. His Most Valuable Player Award is the first for any Green Bay Packer since 1966, when then Packer quarterback and MVP Bart Starr led the Green and Gold to its first of two Super Bowl championships. The Packers and all their loyal fans hope history repeats itself this year.

On behalf of Wisconsinites and Green Bay Packers' fans everywhere, I congratulate you, Brett Favre, on your MVP season and a job well done.●

THE BUDGET IMPASSE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is becoming more obvious every day that the White House is not prepared to reach an agreement with the Congress to balance the budget. We have not seen any specific proposal from the administration to make any changes that would, in fact, lead to a balanced budget. They are unnecessarily shutting down Government services and programs and furloughing Government workers.

The Congress must now act to identify the activities that should be funded and pass legislation that puts people who are really needed back to work. There has been too much political grandstanding. It is time for that to end.

We should not give up our goal of getting spending under control and balancing the budget. That probably means electing a new President later this year who will cooperate with the Congress in this effort. In the meantime, I am prepared, and I know other Senators are prepared to work with the Republican majority and with like-minded Democrats to get the Government back in business with reductions in those programs that should be cut back, and to resolve this impasse.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I posed a question to the Senator from New Mexico and his time then expired. I ask unanimous consent to yield to him at this moment to respond to that question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

THE SHUTDOWN

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator from Maryland. I will be brief. I did want to conclude my answer to his question.

I think what we have is a very troublesome development in the way that the Congress and the President are interacting. It seems that the Congress is going to take the view that it only has a responsibility to enact a Defense bill, that other bills can go their own way—and, of course, its own appropriation, the legislative appropriation bill—and it is up to the President to try to get the others enacted. If that is the case, then you have essentially a hostage-taking or a standoff, which I think is very destructive of the system of Government as it was intended.

This hostage-taking can be a two-way street. Hostage-taking begets more hostage-taking. As I indicated before, the President would be ill-advised, in my opinion, if these are going to be the ground rules for the interaction with the Congress, to sign a legislative appropriations bill in this new session of Congress until all appropriations bills for the executive branch have been signed and put into law.

I am also greatly concerned that we are not going to be able to get good cooperation between the Legislature and the President on doing a Defense appropriation bill. If, as Congressman LIVINGSTON points out, once the President signs the Defense appropriations bill, the Congress is then absolved from the responsibility to work with the President on getting the other appropriations bills signed, that, to me, is a very troublesome situation, which I take as a great problem for all of us.

Mr. President, I appreciate the chance to respond, and I hope that a reasonable resolution of these problems can be found. I thank the Senator from Maryland for the time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I briefly want to add to the comments of the Senator from New Mexico on this particular matter. To make our constitutional system work requires, I believe, a certain amount of restraint and good judgment on the part of all decisionmakers. It must be an essential premise of our system that one is not willing to subvert everything, in effect to bring the whole building crashing down, in order to get your way. I never understood democracy to work that way. There has to be a certain amount of accommodation. Obviously, the basic functions of Government should continue. Are we to reach a state of affairs where every time there is a sharp policy difference—and people can obviously hold sharply different opinions—that for one side to gain its way, it brings the Government to a halt and inflicts all of this harm that is being felt across the country?

I ask unanimous consent that a Washington Post story giving examples of such harm be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SARBANES. The headline is: ''Day 19: Federal Siege Takes Public, Private Hostages.''

It says:

> The partial shutdown of the federal government dragged through its 19th straight day yesterday with one clear effect. It took even more hostages.
>
> Health officials in Nebraska, facing a widespread flu outbreak, urged Federal officials to reopen the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to help them assess and contain the problem. The federal Meals on Wheels Program, which delivers hot food daily to more than 600,000 needy senior citizens, is running out of money and may be partially closed by week's end. The Peace Corps, also desperately short of cash, began drawing up plans to recall some or all of its 7,200 members worldwide if the shutdown persists much longer.
>
> In Mariposa County, CA, home to Yosemite National Park, which has been closed throughout one of its busiest times of the year, the number of private-sector layoffs climbed past 1,600. Most are hotel, restaurant and gas station workers who usually can depend on the revenue that they collect during the holiday season to carry them until the summer.
>
> One-fourth of the adults in the county are now out of work, and officials there have declared an economic emergency.

This is no way to do business, obviously. There is no reason to it. It does not make common sense. There is a tremendous ripple effect throughout the private sector of people dependent on Federal contracts and Federal activities. Needlessly and harmfully the shutdown is resulting in laying off people in the private as well as the public sector.

The distinguished Senator from Virginia, in his comments earlier, made reference to one such occurrence about which he had received notice only this morning. Currently half a million Federal workers are coming to work and not getting a paycheck. Another quarter of a million have been furloughed and are not getting paychecks. Workers in the private sector now are not going to get paychecks. How is it anticipated that people will be able to handle this situation?

The Federal workers are told that once they go back, they will be paid. But who can bridge the intervening period? Unfortunately, there may be a lack of sensitivity in the Congress because, many Members have significant economic means and, therefore, the loss of a paycheck—which is not happening for them—does not really place a burden upon them. They can handle that situation. But most people are not so well situated. Whether they work for the Federal Government or whether they are in the private sector, they

need a regular paycheck in order to meet their obligations, such as mortgage payments, car payments, and school payments.

Nearly half of the Federal employees—46 percent—make less than $35,000 a year. Three quarters of all Federal employees make less than $50,000 a year. Less than 1 percent—six-tenths of 1 percent of all Federal employees—make over $100,000 a year. Members of Congress make more than that. Close to 100 percent of all Federal employees make less than Members of Congress. Now, these employees cannot move from period to period without a paycheck. We need to put them back to work.

The New York Times had an editorial this morning, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. SARBANES. The editorial stated:

> The turmoil and uncertainty created by vast numbers of Federal workers not going to work or not being paid is poisoning the atmosphere for progress on the budget. Too much hardship has already been inflicted, not only on the 760,000 unpaid workers, but on millions of Americans who cannot get visas, loans, or any number of other Federal services. Congress and the President should reopen the government now.

I absolutely agree with that sentiment. There is a colleague in the House, in the Republican leadership in the House, who said in mid-November, ''You have a group in our conference who could not care less if the Government shuts down. They will be cheering.'' What an abdication of responsibility.

Do Members of Congress, as my distinguished colleague from New Mexico states, think they have no responsibility for ensuring that the Government continues to function and providing the basic services upon which so many of our people are dependent?

The people in the private sector, some will go bankrupt out of this escapade. They will go bankrupt. I have had people call my office who say, ''We are not going to be able to make it. We set up a small private business and things were working fairly well and now we are confronting a situation where we may well go under.'' For 19 days now we have been through this situation after the previous closedown of 6 days, all in order to try to bring a coercive pressure, a scorched earth bargaining tactic, with respect to the larger issue of the 7-year budget projection.

Now, that issue involves many difficult and complex questions and a strong difference over what the priorities should be. But in my judgment, it is an irresponsible and impermissible tactic to use the closing of the Government, which has never been done before, to use the closing of the Government as a coercive pressure in to achieve a certain result with respect to the larger budget issues.

Are we going to descend, deteriorate into such practices in the Congress, thereby falling short of meeting the responsibilities I think we have under the Constitution? Mr. President, Congress and the President should reopen the Government now as the majority leader sought to do when he moved the continuing resolution and sent it over to the House. House adoption of it would bring this crisis to an end.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 4, 1996]

DAY 19: FEDERAL SIEGE TAKES PUBLIC, PRIVATE HOSTAGES

(By Rene Sanchez)

The partial shutdown of the federal government dragged through its 19th straight day yesterday with one clear effect. It took even more hostages.

Health officials in Nebraska, facing a widespread flu outbreak, urged federal officials to reopen the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to help them assess and contain the problem. The federal Meals on Wheels Program, which delivers hot food daily to more than 600,000 needy senior citizens, is running out of money and may be partially closed by week's end. The Peace Corps, also desperately short of cash, began drawing up plans to recall some or all of its 7,200 members worldwide if the shutdown persists much longer.

In Mariposa County, Calif., home to Yosemite National Park, which has been closed throughout one of its busiest times of the year, the number of private-sector layoffs climbed past 1,600. Most are hotel, restaurant and gas station workers who usually can depend on the revenue that they collect during the holiday season to carry them until the summer.

One-fourth of the adults in the county are now out of work, and officials there have declared an economic emergency. The local newspaper has launched a food drive for those in need, and radio stations in the Yosemite area are urging residents in neighboring counties to drive over and do business there.

''Who's paying the price for this? Not Congress or the president, but the average citizen,'' said Michael Coffield, the Mariposa County administrator. ''All the money our residents are losing is gone for good. Every day, it is getting more and more dire.''

Ever since the shutdown began, President Clinton and congressional Democrats have insisted that it would pose significant hardships, and Clinton made his most strident remarks yet on that subject yesterday by ticking off a lengthy list of problems he said the government's partial closure is causing Americans.

But some Republican leaders have countered by saying the shutdown shows how large parts of the government do not affect many Americans. Other Republicans contend that short-term problems from the shutdown are far less important than the long-term crisis an unbalanced budget will create.

Labor Secretary Robert B. Reich said that his department has received more than 63,000 phone calls regarding working and wage complaints that it has not been able to answer in the past three weeks.

Federal courts have remained open throughout the shutdown by running on filing fees and other miscellaneous funds. But court officials are now predicting that they will exhaust those emergency funds by Sunday. David A. Sellers, spokesman for the federal courts' administrative office, said at that point it would be up to individual courts around the country to decide whether to close or to keep some of their business going.

The Peace Corps also has stayed partially open during the shutdown by using leftover funds from the last fiscal year. That pool of money is now drying up. Officials said that if the shutdown persists another week or so they may be forced to recall volunteers who work in 95 countries, because the agency will not be able to pay their living allowances.

''We're having to take a very serious look at that as this goes on,'' said Andre Oliver, a Peace Corps spokesman.

The furlough also has begun to threaten the complicated process by which scientists, universities and other research organizations apply to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) for money to finance experiments and other scientific studies.

January is the beginning of a thrice-yearly cycle in which grant applications are reviewed by committees of outside experts, and then recommendations on whether to fund them is passed on to NIH officials. None of the preparation for that is occurring.

NIH also has about 2,000 grants that have been approved but whose financing hasn't been provided to the researchers in the last month. About half are multi-year projects already underway, and about half are for new research waiting to begin.

''We're all sort of teetering on the edge now,'' said Wendy Baldwin, NIH's deputy director for extramural research. ''There's a whole cascade of scheduling in jeopardy.''

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, Jan. 4, 1996]

THE BUDGET SCRUM

For fans of political games, President Clinton put on a rip-roaring show yesterday, as he charged right through the budget rift that has opened up on the Republican side between Newt Gingrich and Bob Dole. The new year thus dawns with the surprising spectacle of two archrivals, Mr. Dole and Mr. Clinton, trying to look like grown-ups while the Republicans in the House insist childshly that the only way to apply leverage on the President is to keep the Government closed. More and more it looks as if the zealous freshmen are calling the shots in the House.

Say this for the freshmen Republicans. In theory they are just the kind of people the public says it wants in politics—men and women of principle who have a lot more on their minds than re-election. But zeal needs to be harnessed to a caring practicality. In the current impasse, Mr. Clinton and Mr. Dole have it right. The turmoil and uncertainty created by vast numbers of Federal workers not going to work or not being paid is poisoning the atmosphere for progress on the budget. Too much hardship has already been inflicted, not only on the 760,000 unpaid workers, but on millions of Americans who cannot get visas, loans or any number of other Federal services. Congress and the President should reopen the Government now.

But it is also time for the White House to help resolve the budget impasse by sketching more details of the President's own thinking on how to achieve a balanced budget in seven years, as House Republicans demand. Mr. Clinton's skill in gaining political advantage from the current situation has been impressive. But his tactics leave even his allies confused on how much he really does want a compromise balanced budget, as opposed to an impasse on which he can run for re-election while defending longstanding Democratic principles.

By all accounts, the long hours of negotiating over the holiday weekend involved a lot of Mr. Clinton and Mr. Gingrich discussing the arcana of Federal social policies while many other people in the room rolled

their eyes. There is no sign yet of real horse-trading except a leak here and there. For instance, the White House might be willing to modify its opposition to a cut in the capital gains tax. The Republicans seem willing to scale back their $240 billion tax cut. But the House freshmen and their allies insist that they simply do not trust Mr. Clinton to bring the process to a conclusion until they get a clearer signal of where he would be willing to make concessions, particularly on Medicare, Medicaid and welfare.

The freshmen militants, Mr. Gingrich and even the Democratic leadership have the luxury of being dealt into a game whose outcome means less to them than to Mr. Clinton and Mr. Dole. With their eyes on the Presidential race, each man is trying to calculate whether he has more to gain from accommodation or recalcitrance. Mr. Dole has promised to bring adult leadership to the White House, but he does not look very adult if he cannot stand up to his party's kiddie-corps zealots. Mr. Clinton needs to emerge as a President who can stay resolute in the face of opposition; but at a certain point the Chief Executive of a Government that cannot open for business will begin to look weak.

Mr. Dole is right when he observes that Americans are growing impatient with the budget impasse. Right now, Mr. Clinton may have more to gain by holding out on the budget while insisting he wants to reopen the Government. But there is clearly a deal within reach, and the public will remember who walks out of the wreckage with it.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for morning business be extended until the hour of 12:30, and Senators be allowed to have 10 minutes to speak.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the majority leader has indicated to the Senator from Virginia that that is quite agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SHUTDOWN

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, all my life I have heard the saying, ''Can't see the forest for the trees.'' I think those words can be appropriately applied to the situation we now find ourselves in. For too many Federal workers, for too many thousands of honest, hard-working Americans trying to make a decent living, this budget impasse and shutdown has demonstrated to them that some of their elected representatives cannot see the forest for the trees.

While some are wrapped up in trying to score political points, to gain political favor in certain circles, they are missing the point of what is really going on outside the beltway. How disappointing it is to pick up the morning's Washington Post with the headlines, ''Employees Find They Are an Afterthought.'' How sad it is to know that people who need food, who need medicine and basic care will be deprived of services. How sad it is, Mr. President, to hear some demagog the situation by saying that nobody is missing those Government workers and we need to get rid of more of them.

My office, as others have stated here this morning, is being overrun with calls and letters about how this shutdown is affecting families in Kentucky, far outside the beltway, far away from the political arena. A mother in Lexington, KY, wrote me, ''Most of us live from paycheck to paycheck. We cannot survive without being paid. I am a single parent struggling to pay rent, a car payment, and keep food in the house, so I haven't been able to save part of my salary. If I'm not paid on January 16, I will be evicted.'' This is a woman that was on welfare, that was able to get a job and get off of welfare, and now the Government is forcing her back into welfare. She asks in her letter, ''Isn't this the United States of America? Isn't our Government supposed to be by the people and for the people?'' ''Federal employees,'' she says, ''are also people.''

She is speaking from her heart about real people, about the thousands who cannot get mortgage insurance, thousands who are losing home loans, thousands working in service industries, the rippling effect, facing the daily threat of being laid off. Homeowners in eastern Kentucky threatened with landslides because the Office of Surface Mining is operating on reduced staff and reduced funding. Real people, Mr. President.

Another person wrote, ''I'm excepted from furlough which means I'm working now with no pay. The check I received yesterday was one-quarter of my salary. My mortgage is due. This one-quarter does not cover the mortgage. What is worse is that I have two small children. I must continue to pay my baby sitter to keep them after school while I go to work for no pay.''

I received a call from a grandmother. I do not know how many in here have ever been involved in trying to help a couple adopt a child. When I was Governor of Kentucky we worked with agencies. It is an emotional period. It is a real decision to adopt a child. So I got a call from this grandmother. She was worried about her granddaughter. The adoption of a baby has been halted because the agencies do not have enough money to process the necessary paperwork. That is hurt, Mr. President. That is not inconvenience, that is hurt. You have hurt that family that made up their mind to adopt a child. That is hurt, capital H-u-r-t. She is looking to her representatives for help and answers. What do we do to help her? How do you tell someone that is out there working hard, paying their taxes, that because of circumstances completely out of their control they cannot go forward with adopting a child?

Mr. President, the hardest thing I have had to do in my 21 years in the U.S. Senate is to say to men and women in the military to go defend our country on some foreign shore, to lay their lives on the line. One thing I have told them, and one thing that helps, that whatever I can do to support them when they come back, or their loved ones if they do not come back, I will do.

Looking now at the VA, ''VA Runs on Promises.'' ''Nursing home workers tend patients without pay. They are stripping the sheets off, the laundry, trying to take care of our veterans, for no pay.''

So we say to our veterans, the only reason you are being taken care of is because they are willing to come as long as they can. These people cannot get another job. They are prohibited from getting another job to have some income, maybe, to offset the loss of their paycheck.

Let me also tell you about ''Helen's Hotline'' from the VA hospital in Lexington. What are they doing? Food—God's Pantry, in Lexington, distributes food to the homeless and those who need food. They will provide up to 3 weeks of food to those people. They are even giving them transportation to God's Pantry in order to pick up some food. Food and social and spiritual support are being offered by the VA hospital there in Lexington, stress relief, and the canteen service will accept—think about this, now—accept postdated checks from the cafeteria or retail store through January 17.

Creditors' letters have been sent from the Director of the VA to the utilities, the mortgage companies, the lenders, the bankers, asking for leniency because they do not have their check.

I think the lowest blow of all is they have set up a food bank at the VA hospital for their employees, and they are being asked to bring food, those who can afford it, to bring nonperishable food to the VA hospital to help their employees. They have asked the citizens of Lexington to help with the food bank and financial contributions, monetary donations. They are trying to van pool and help the employees because they have lost their cars because they could not make the payments. These people do not wait on payments: ''Oh, go ahead, that's all right, you don't have to pay me until you get paid.'' That does not work.

''Things to do.'' The utilities companies? Ask them to be lenient. Mortgage company? Ask them to be lenient. How lenient will these people be?

''What is this,'' one asked me. ''Is this really America? Is this what America is all about? Is this how the world's greatest superpower functions?''

These people want a resolution to the crisis. They want to reopen Government just like the distinguished majority leader, Senate Republicans, and Senate Democrats want. As one said, it is time to stop the nonsense going on here in Washington. They agree with our majority leader when he says, ''Enough is enough.''

Let us reopen Government. Let us stop this insanity and get on with the shaping of a fair and equitable budget agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the

full text of two letters I referred to in my statement earlier.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 3, 1996.

DEAR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVE: I'm writing to speak out for furloughed federal employees and working federal employees who are not being paid. I happen to be one of those directed to work without pay. Since I came to work for the federal government in 1977 federal employees have taken the brunt of budget cuts and have been reviled by Presidents and Congress. Our salaries have fallen far behind the private sector. It is proposed that our pensions be further cut and even those of us who had careers covered under Social Security before coming to the government have had our future Social Security benefits cut in half. However, this budget battle is the final outrage against federal employees. What private company could order their employees to work, but not pay them? Ironically, the federal government would be on their doorstep immediately. I can't even file for unemployment benefits since I have been directed to work, and am doing so without pay.

Most of us live from paycheck to paycheck. We cannot survive without being paid. I am a single parent, struggling to pay rent, a car payment and keep food in the house so I haven't been able to save part of my salary.

If I am not paid on January 16, 1996, I will be evicted. My landlord isn't interested in the reason he doesn't receive his rent. He just demands it be paid on the 1st day of each month. I will also lose my car if this continues and my credit will be ruined. It may be already.

We were given a letter to send to our creditors asking for forbearance. Do you really believe that the banks, insurance companies and Corporate America care why our bills are not being paid. NO—THEY DO NOT!

Isn't this the United States of America? Isn't our government supposed to be by the people and for the people? Federal employees are also people. We pay taxes. We vote. We are part of the people referred to in the Bill of Rights and the Constitution. I would have never believed this could happen in this country. We are being deprived of our basic human rights because we happen to be federal employees. My mind almost refuses to accept that this is happening to me, but the realities of unpaid bills and basic needs not being met jerk me back into the real world that I must live in—unknown to you!

I have related my personal situation to you but please remember that it is also representative of the situation of about 700,000 citizens of this country who have given daily of themselves to serve this country.

I am frustrated, fearful, resentful and very angry over the situation I have been placed in by you. Regardless of your political allegiance or your personal position on the national budget issues, you have severely and wrongfully damaged my life forever. The harm done to this point is irreversible and the damage irreparable. Please wake up and stop this nightmare.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

JANUARY 3, 1996.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN, I am an employee of Social Security. As you may be aware, as a field office employee, I am excepted from furlough which means I am working now with no pay. The check I received yesterday was for ½ salary (through 12/15/95). My mortgage is due and this ½ does not cover the mortgage. What is worse is that I have 2 small children. I must continue to pay a baby sitter to keep them after school while I go to work with no pay.

The end result is that we do not have money for anything except utilities. My children wanted to know this morning why they had left over Christmas turkey and dressing in their lunch boxes instead of their usual chips and sandwiches. It is because these, the chips and sandwich are now ''non-essential'' items in our household and because you all can not see fit to work the budget out—they must suffer. If you have a better explanation that I can give a 5 yr. old and 8 year old—please let me know. This is beginning to HURT! My children do not understand and neither do I. Please work this out—Soon!! Before I have to explain to them why we have no heat—

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, we hear a lot about ''all the President has to do is sign the bills.'' If you put things in the bills that are not acceptable, then you ought not to expect it to be signed. That is trying to put the President in a position where he cannot sign it. All we have to do is pass a clean CR and put Government back to work.

The Senate has done that. The Democrats in the House are ready. There is only one group, one element that is saying to my people down there: ''We do not care whether you pay the mortgage, whether you pay your utilities, whether you buy food''—things of that nature. We think we ought to get with those people and say to them, let us get on with the running of the Government. We can balance the budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GREGG). The Senator from Oklahoma.

ACCOMMODATIONS ON THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, it is with interest I listened to some of our colleagues talk about the Government shutting down, and I also note yesterday, when the President had a press conference, he said the congressional Republicans shut down the Government. At least he said Congress shut down Government. He mentioned several examples.

Several of the examples that have been mentioned, both on the floor and by the President and by other people, some of the horror stories of individuals who have lost their jobs, who are not being paid, are in agencies for which the President vetoed the appropriation bill. One agency that has received as much attention as any other is Interior, the appropriation bill that is covered by Interior, dealing with national parks and the museums.

The Washington Post has run some front-page articles talking about the museums not being open, the Smithsonian shut down, national parks being shut down, not having access for individuals wanting to have their vacations and go to the parks, not being able to get in because the Government shut it down and, as the President said, Congress shut it down.

I just happen to be aware of the fact the President vetoed the Interior bill. The President is the one who shut down the parks. The President is the one who did not make it possible for the parks to be opened. If he had signed the bill, those people would have been paid. They would not have been furloughed. The parks would be open. The Smithsonian would be open. Those people would have had coverage. There would be no disruption.

I just make that point. It is interesting that everything is Congress' fault. The President vetoed the Interior bill. I think that is unfortunate.

I used to manage that bill. Now Senator GORTON is managing that bill, and I think he has done a very good job. I looked at the veto message dealing with Interior. There are different reasons why the President vetoed the bill. These are very poor excuses for vetoing a bill. I have urged others, and I hope maybe, I will tell my friends and colleagues, maybe within a very short period of time we will have another Interior bill on the floor. I hope that is the case. I hope it happens today.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, the House of Representatives is going to take up a veto override today on that. I was over there earlier this morning.

Mr. NICKLES. I appreciate that. The veto override may not happen. I hope it does. That is one way we could get the employees back to work immediately.

If that does not happen, I hope we will take the original Interior bill as it passed through both Houses and maybe make some changes. I am looking at the President's veto message on Interior. Most of these changes could be made with very little dollars involved and maybe some better understanding.

We had the Presiding Officer, a moment ago, who is from Alaska—part of it was dealing with Tongass. There is a misunderstanding on what would happen in the Tongass. Some people were saying the Interior bill as passed would open up a lot of additional clear cutting. I do not think that is the case. We can clarify that, and we should clarify it.

I am looking through some of the other things that were mentioned. I ask unanimous consent to have the President's veto message printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NICKLES. But these are minuscule problems. This is no reason to shut down the Interior Department, national parks, Forest Service and so on, and everything else that is covered by this bill, Indian Health Services—you name it.

So, let us try to accommodate. Let us make a couple of concessions. Let us work to resolve some of the problems that are raised in here. It can be done with very few dollars and open up the Interior Department, open up the national parks, open up the Smithsonian, open up the national museums. There is no reason not to. The President should not have vetoed the bill in the

first place, but the President is responsible for those parks being closed.

Yesterday, or the day before, there was an article in the Post talking about somebody having a concession service adjacent to a park and now they had to let their employees go. Those employees, incidentally, will not be covered by the bill once it passes. They will not be paid. They are not Federal employees; they are contractors. And if they are not contracting with the Federal Government, if they just happen to be doing business adjacent to the Federal Government operation, they are out of luck.

Again, I fault President Clinton in this case. I think he made a mistake in vetoing the bill. But for him to say Congress is the reason why those agencies are shut down is not the case, and that is not the case in Interior.

It is not the case in other agencies as well. A lot of us are very concerned about the Veterans' Department being closed. I agree with my colleagues from Maryland and other places saying if you have a physician or if you have a nurse or if you have somebody working in a veterans hospital, that person ought to be paid. It does not make a lot of sense not to pay them.

Why are they not being paid? The appropriation bill was not signed. We passed the appropriation bill, we funded the Veterans' Department, the President vetoed the bill.

Why did he veto the bill? I have a copy of his veto message. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. NICKLES. But we should take care of veterans and people who are working in veterans hospitals. They should be paid. They should not be furloughed. And we can solve that problem. I am hopeful before very long we will pass the VA–HUD bill, and let us look at the President's veto message and see if some accommodations can and could and should be made in that area.

But let no one misunderstand. The President vetoed the bill that funds the Veterans' Department. It was on his desk. If he would have signed that bill, those individuals would not have been furloughed. They would not have been working without pay. So we need to get past this maybe rhetorical war and who is at fault. The President vetoed several of these bills.

One of the other things that maybe concerns me where Congress is largely at fault is dealing with the agency called Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education—actually three different agencies. We have heard some people talk about how some people are impacted. This Senate has not passed that appropriations bill. It is the only appropriations bill we have not passed. You might say, ''Why hasn't it?'' We are supposed to pass that bill before the end of September. We have not passed it.

Unfortunately, there has been a filibuster on even a motion to proceed to that bill. I have been around here a long time. I cannot remember an appropriations bill where Members filibustered the motion to proceed. We usually have fought out our differences—win, lose, or draw—on all appropriations bills. Somebody said it has riders on it. All appropriations have riders on how are we going to spend money. This bill is no different than any other bill. It had some riders. It says the administration will not spend money on a variety of different things. That is part of Congress' legislative responsibility. But we have not even been able to vote on the Labor-HHS bill. That is unfortunate.

I hear today and read in the paper about scare tactics—that it is terrible; we are not able to take care of the Bureau of Labor Statistics or Meals on Wheels. It is because, unfortunately, many Democrats will not allow us to bring that bill up and vote on it. I hope maybe we can get that resolved because that bill needs to pass. We need to vote. We need to find out where the votes are. Some people are objecting to us even considering the bill.

Looking at several of the bills the President has vetoed, Interior, which I alluded to before. If you add Interior, 76,000 employees are impacted. The Forest Service is funded at 38,000 under that bill. Indian Health is at 15,000, for a total of 133,800 employees who are impacted because the President vetoed the Interior bill. That was not Congress' veto. It was the President's veto.

Again, I reiterate my statement about my offer to work with people. I think we ought to make some changes—minor changes—and pass the Interior bill.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. NICKLES. I am happy to yield.

Mr. SARBANES. I welcome this attitude that we need to try to work out the differences. That is how I think you legislate.

The fact is, though, that when President Reagan and President Bush vetoed appropriations bills, until we worked out the differences we passed the continuing resolutions to allow the Government to continue to function. We then considered seriously the basis upon which the President had vetoed the legislation and tried to work out an accommodation so that an appropriations bill could be passed by the Congress to which the President could give his consent.

So the veto by the President of legislation because it contains provisions with which he disagrees is a standard practice.

What has happened in the past is either we could work that out, or we have provided a continuing resolution in the meantime while we tried to work it out. That has not been done in this instance. I do say to the Senator that I think that his suggestion that we ought to look at the basis of the veto message and see what accommodations can be made between the two branches in terms of passing another bill, my understanding is the other side simply wants to send the same bill back which I would not regard as a constructive action.

I assume from the Senator's comments that he would not regard it as a positive or constructive action in the circumstance either.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, to respond to my colleague, I really see no reason that the President vetoed the Interior bill and put people out of work. My point is that for the President to say, ''Well, this is Congress' fault these people are not working,'' I just disagree. I think he bears direct responsibility in vetoing the Interior bill which is impacting the lives of 133,000 employees, and also for his actions in vetoing Commerce, State, Justice, as well as VA–HUD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. In looking at VA–HUD, and if we are not able to break this impasse soon, I tell my colleague from Maryland that it is my hope that we will take up—maybe we cannot pass—the HUD bill. Maybe there is a dispute. But we ought to be able to pass the veterans bill. My guess is we could pass that very quickly and maybe some additional things.

I worked with the Senator MIKULSKI. I was on that Appropriations Committee. I cannot help but think we could fund most areas in that bill. I have a copy of that veto message. I think we should be able to fund people working for the Veterans' Department, and hopefully we will be able to break that logjam. We should do it today, or certainly before the end of this week.

In looking at Commerce, State, Justice, the Justice portion of it I have heard some people allude to the fact, well, we are going to have problems with prisons; we are going to have problems with clerks; and so on. Hopefully we will pass the Justice portion of it. I notice there is a dispute in Commerce. Maybe we could leave that one set aside, or other areas.

My point is that the President vetoed that bill. That bill has impacted 194,000 employees. We passed that bill. The President could have signed the bill and then said, well, he sends a rescission, or he could have requested a supplemental appropriations. That has happened as well. The President did not do that.

I think the President's pollster was whispering in his ear saying, ''This is looking good if you stand up to Congress and veto some bills. We will reenact Harry Truman, and say the heck with Congress.'' Unfortunately, that

has put thousands of people into a furlough situation, or thousands of people into working without pay.

The President vetoed those bills. He could have signed those bills and then worked out a budget agreement. He could have signed those bills and then requested a supplemental appropriation, if he did not think we were spending enough money in some areas. If he thought we were spending too much money in other areas, he could have sent a rescissions package. But instead he was in a veto mood, and he vetoed these bills having an impact on hundreds of thousands of people, all of which he is trying to give Congress full credit for.

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NICKLES. No. I am almost out of time.

So the President is directly responsible for putting hundreds of thousands of people—I will submit this for the RECORD as well—who were impacted because he vetoed the bills. That was his right to do so. But for him to come back and say that was all Congress' fault I think was incorrect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD this chart.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to the printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BALL'S IN THE PRESIDENT'S COURT

The following bills have been vetoed by the President. These three vetoes have adversely affected more than 620,000 employees, as follows:

Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary:	
Justice	102,000
Commerce	25,000
Judiciary	28,000
State	25,000
SBA	5,800
USIA	8,000
Total	194,000
Interior:	
Interior	76,000
Indian Health	15,500
Forest	38,000
Energy	2,300
Miscellaneous	2,000
Total	133,800
VA–HUD:	
NASA	20,000
National Science Foundation	2,000
Veterans	240,000
HUD	11,000
EPA/miscellaneous	20,000
Total	293,000
Overall total	620,900

Source: House Appropriations Committee.

EXHIBIT 1

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 1977, the ''Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996.''

This bill is unacceptable because it would unduly restrict our ability to protect America's natural resources and cultural heritage, promote the technology we need for long-term energy conservation and economic growth, and provide adequate health, educational, and other services to Native Americans.

First, the bill makes wrong-headed choices with regard to the management and preservation of some of our most precious assets. In the Tongass National Forest in Alaska, it would allow harmful clear-cutting, require the sale of timber at unsustainable levels, and dictate the use of an outdated forest plan for the next 2 fiscal years.

In the Columbia River basin in the Pacific Northwest, the bill would impede implementation of our comprehensive plan for managing public lands—the Columbia River Basin Ecosystem Management Project. It would do this by prohibiting publication of a final Environmental Impact Statement or Record of Decision and requiring the exclusion of information on fisheries and watersheds. The result: a potential return to legal gridlock on timber harvesting, grazing, mining, and other economically important activities.

And in the California desert, the bill undermines our designation of the Mojave National Preserve by cutting funding for the Preserve and shifting responsibility for its management from the National Park Service to the Bureau of Land Management. The Mojave is our newest national park and part of the 1994 California Desert Protection Act—the largest addition to our park system in the lower 48 States. It deserves our support.

Moreover, the bill would impose a misguided moratorium on future listings and critical habitat designations under the Endangered Species Act. And in the case of one endangered species, the marbled murrelet, it would eliminate the normal flexibility for both the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture to use new scientific information in managing our forests.

Second, the bill slashes funding for the Department of Energy's energy conservation programs. This is short-sighted and unwise. Investment in the technology of energy conservation is important for our Nation's long-term economic strength and environmental health. We should be doing all we can to maintain and sharpen our competitive edge, not back off.

Third, this bill fails to honor our historic obligations toward Native Americans. It provides inadequate funding for the Indian Health Service and our Indian Education programs. And the cuts targeted at key programs in the Bureau of Indian Affairs are crippling—including programs that support child welfare; adult vocational training; law enforcement and detention services; community fire protection; and general assistance to low-income Indian individuals and families.

Moreover, the bill would unfairly single our certain self-governance tribes in Washington State for punitive treatment. Specifically, it would penalize these tribes financially for using legal remedies in disputes with non-tribal owners of land within reservations.

Finally, the bill represents a dramatic departure from our commitment to support for the arts and the humanities. It cuts funding of the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities so deeply as to jeopardize their capacity to keep providing the cultural, educational, and artistic programs that enrich America's communities large and small.

For these reasons and others my Administration has conveyed to the Congress in earlier communications, I cannot accept this bill. It does not reflect my priorities or the values of the American people. I urge the Congress to send me a bill that truly serves the interests of our Nation and our citizens.

William J. Clinton.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1995.*

EXHIBIT 2

To the House of Representatives

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2099, the ''Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1996.''

H.R. 2099 would threaten public health and the environment, end programs that are helping communities help themselves, close the door on college for thousands of young people, and leave veterans seeking medical care with fewer treatment options.

The bill includes no funds for the highly successful National Service program. If such funding were eliminated, the bill would cost nearly 50,000 young Americans the opportunity to help their community, through AmeriCorps, to address vital local needs such as health care, crime prevention, and education while earning a monetary award to help them pursue additional education or training. I will not sign any version of this appropriations bill that does not restore funds for this vital program.

This bill includes a 22 percent cut in requested funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), including a 25 percent cut in enforcement that would cripple EPA efforts to enforce laws against polluters. Particularly objectionable are the bill's 25 percent cut in Superfund, which would continue to expose hundreds of thousands of citizens to dangerous chemicals and cuts, which would hamper efforts to train workers in hazardous waste cleanup.

In addition to serve funding cuts for EPA, the bill also includes legislative riders that were tacked onto the bill without any hearings or adequate public input, including one that would prevent EPA from exercising its authority under the Clean Water Act to prevent wetlands losses.

I am concerned about the bill's $762 million reduction to my request for funds that would go directly to States and needy cities for clean water and drinking water needs, such as assistance to clean up Boston Harbor. I also object to cuts the Congress has made in environmental technology, the climate change action plan, and other environmental programs.

The bill would reduce funding for the Council for Environmental Quality by more than half. Such a reduction would severely hamper the Council's ability to provide me with advice on environmental policy and carry out its responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act.

The bill provides no new funding for the Community Development Financial Institutions program, an important initiative for bringing credit and growth to communities long left behind.

While the bill provides spending authority for several important initiatives of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), including Community Development Block Grants, homeless assistance and the sale of HUD-owned properties, it lacks funding for others. For example, the bill provides no funds to support economic development initiatives; it has insufficient funds for incremental rental vouchers; and it cuts nearly in half my request for tearing down the most severely distressed housing projects. Also, the bill contains harmful riders that would transfer HUD's Fair Housing activities to the Justice Department and eliminate Federal preferences in the section 8, tenant-based program.

The bill provides less than I requested for the medical care of this Nation's veterans. It includes significant restrictions on funding for the Secretary of Veterans Affairs that

appear designed to impede him from carrying out his duties as an advocate for veterans. Further, the bill does not provide necessary funding for VA hospital construction.

For these reasons and others my Administration has conveyed to the Congress in earlier communications, I cannot accept this bill. This bill does not reflect the values that Americans hold dear. I urge the Congress to send me an appropriations bill for these important priorities that truly serves the American people.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 1995.*

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN CRISIS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, first of all I want to identify with what I think has been a very compelling case made by a variety of my colleagues here on the floor of the Senate, by the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Kentucky, in describing in very human terms what is happening with real families impacted by the Government shutdown. And that same situation is happening in spades in my own State of Massachusetts. There are heartrending stories of families that in so many circumstances really are being devastated. The adverse impact on children continues. And it is very real. The prospects are of serious consequence, indeed. And that is a very important issue for the American people to dwell on, to be concerned about and also to bring their best judgment on the levels of power to try to remedy it.

The Government shutdown was remedied here in the U.S. Senate by the actions that were taken by Senator DOLE, and I think all of us want to take note of his leadership and understanding—that this charade of closing down the Government is nothing but a charade.

If our good friends, our Republican friends, the majority in the House and Senate, had met their responsibilities, these various appropriations bills would have been passed as has been done in other years. If they had been vetoed, these matters would have been worked out in the same way they have been historically—as has been described by the Senator from Maryland.

It is not a shutdown because even our Republican friends say they are going to pay all of these individuals eventually. So it is really not a shutdown. The taxpayers are going to pay these people.

Maybe they get some satisfaction, the Senator from Oklahoma and others, from the fact that the Americans are not going to be working now. They are not going to work, and, yet, our Republican friends say eventually they are going to be paid. And in the meantime, we have these human conditions and human tragedies that are taking place. The American people understand it. I think all of us are very hopeful that our Republican friends in the House are going to follow the leadership that has been provided in the Senate by Republicans and permit the opportunity for the services to be continued which are in so many instances essential for the well-being of our fellow citizens. And, I am hopeful that whatever differences exist can be worked out as has been part of the proud tradition of this country.

Mr. President, I wish to address an issue which is related to these negotiations which are taking place between the leadership, Republican and Democrat, and the President. It is one aspect of these negotiations which I think bears close attention by our colleagues here in the Congress and the Senate but most of all by our senior citizens and by working families in this country, because it is a matter that will have a very significant and important adverse impact on them if it is included in the budget proposal.

Like others, I have stated that we are for the balanced budget, but we do believe it has to meet the basic criteria of being fair and just to the American people. That means if there is going to be belt-tightening, it ought to be across the board and not be particularly burdensome to the neediest and most vulnerable, the children, disabled, the neediest families in our society. That means we ought to make sure whatever the final outcome is going to be, it will be fair and just for all Americans. It is on that issue that I address the Senate for these few remaining moments this morning.

LEGISLATING A CHANGE IN THE CPI

Mr. KENNEDY. As the President and the congressional leaders discuss ways to achieve a balanced budget, one idea should be rejected out of hand—legislating a change in the Consumer Price Index.

That kind of arbitrary action by Congress would break faith with the elderly and make a mockery of the commitment of both parties not to cut Social Security.

It would raise taxes on low-income working families qualifying for the earned income tax credit—and other working families as well.

It would lead to lower wage increases for millions of workers throughout the country at a time when one of the most serious challenges our society faces is the decline in the living standard for all but the wealthiest families.

Such a change would be harshly regressive in its impact. It would be unprecedented political meddling in what has always been an impartial, factual determination of the CPI.

Reducing the CPI would reduce cost of living adjustments for millions of Americans receiving Social Security benefits, military pensions, veterans' pensions, and civil service retirement. It would reduce the amount of Supplemental security income payments to the needy. Because of indexing of tax brackets, it would raise income taxes for most taxpayers—and reduce the earned income tax credit.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, a 1-percent decrease in the change in the CPI would reduce Government spending and increase Government revenues over the next 7 years, for a total deficit reduction of $281 billion. Some may see this large sum as a magic bullet to balance the budget and avoid other painful choices. But it is a bullet aimed at millions of Americans who need help the most, and who don't deserve this added pain. It makes no sense to fight hard to save Medicare—and then attack Social Security.

Legislating an arbitrary reduction in the CPI would clearly break the compact of Social Security. That compact says, ''work hard, play by the rules, contribute to the system, and, in return, you will be guaranteed retirement security when you are old.'' An essential part of that compact is a fair Social Security COLA, so that senior citizens can be sure that their hard-earned Social Security benefits will not be eaten away by inflation.

Overall, more than three-fourths of the lower spending under the change would come from cuts in Social Security alone. Nearly all the rest would come from other Federal retirement programs. It is the elderly who will pay heavily if Congress adopts this change.

Over the next 10 years, a 1-percent cut in the COLA would reduce the real value of the median income beneficiary's Social Security checks by $5,300. By the 10th year, the real purchasing value of that check would be 9 percent lower—making it even harder than it is today for senior citizens to stretch their limited incomes to pay the bills for housing, food, medical care, and other necessities.

Reducing the Social Security COLA is a direct attack on the retirement benefits that senior citizens have earned. If Congress is to respect family values, it has to value families, especially the millions of elderly families all across America.

Changing the CPI also affects the deficit by increasing taxes, because income tax brackets and the earned income tax credit are indexed to inflation. If tax brackets are not adjusted for inflation, taxes go up and the earned income tax credit goes down.

Failing to adjust tax brackets hits middle income families the hardest. For the wealthy, the change in the CPI would have a minimal impact. A family earning $100,000 would see its taxes rise by one-third of 1 percent of its income. But for families at lower income levels, the differences are far more significant. A family earning $36,000 would face a tax increase that, as a percent of income, would be more than four times as large. The hardest hit of all would be low-income working families who depend on the earned income tax credit. Twelve percent of the total tax increase—$13 billion—would be paid by these low-income hard-working families.

The impact of cutting the CPI reaches well beyond the Federal budget. It is also a direct attack on the wages of working families. Many workers have CPI adjustments in their collective bargaining contracts. But every pay increase is affected by the CPI. If the CPI is reduced by Congress, wages will be lower too for virtually all workers across the country.

There is no greater source of dissatisfaction in American families than the continuing erosion of their living standards. Except for the wealthy, the story of the past two decades has been ''work harder and earn less.'' Cutting the CPI will make a bad situation even worse, by putting even greater downward pressure on the wages of every American.

Lowering the CPI has been presented as merely an overdue technical correction that should be supported as a matter of good government. This claim cannot pass the truth in advertising test.

The technical argument for lowering the CPI has been made by the Boskin Commission, which was appointed by the Senate Finance Committee to examine the issue. The Commission issued an interim report last September, which identifies several biases in the calculation. The Commission asserted that the CPI has overstated inflation by 1.5 percent a year. For the future, the Commission predicted that the CPI would be 1 percent a year too high.

The major problem with the Commission's analysis is that the sources of bias it identifies are also identified by the nonpolitical professional economists at the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor. They have the responsibility for setting the CPI each year. They do so fairly and impartially. They make periodic corrections to take account of any biases—up or down—that affect the index. The Bureau already plans to reduce the CPI by about two-tenths of 1 percent in 1997. This reduction is already assumed in the budget projections for the next 7 years.

The issue is not whether there should be changes in the CPI, but who should make them and how large they should be. The Boskin Commission's work is a poor basis for changing the CPI. As the Commission itself acknowledged, it did little original research. The Commission's membership was stacked with economists who believed that the CPI was overstated. According to Dean Baker, an economist at the Economic Policy Institute, ''All five members had previously testified that they believed the CPI was overstated. Economists who gave contrary testimony * * * were excluded.''

According to Joel Popkin, another expert on the CPI, the Commission comprised five of the six witnesses before the full Finance Committee who gave the highest estimates of bias. As Mr. Popkin also pointed out, the interim report of the Commission falls far short of presenting adequate justification for its conclusions, and therefore provides no basis for Congress to change tax policies or entitlement programs such as Social Security.

In fact, for the elderly, the group most affected by any change, the most authoritative study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics suggests that the CPI may understate rather than overstate the true increase in the cost of living, because of the rapid increase in medical costs for the elderly.

To legislate an arbitrary change in the CPI would be unprecedented. In the entire history of the CPI, the Congress has never tried to impose a politically driven adjustment, and there is no excuse for imposing one now. Senior citizens and working families across the country depend on a fair CPI, and Congress should keep it that way.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, my understanding is that at this point in time, the Senators desiring to be recognized would request unanimous consent to speak for a stipulated period?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 3 minutes and then that the Senate turn and recognize the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi, the majority whip.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CPI AND BLOCKING THE LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION BILL

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I just wish to say to my colleague from Massachusetts, I listened very carefully. This question of the CPI is open for debate. Thus far, consideration has been given in a bipartisan manner by Members on both sides of this aisle, and as yet there has been no resolution. I think, indeed, there is some consideration at the level of the President and his senior advisers on this issue.

But, Mr. President, what disturbs me so much is that the Senator from Massachusetts sought to come here this morning and talk about that issue, yet he fails to address one of the most burning issues indeed on both sides of the aisle here in the U.S. Senate, and that is the inability of the majority leader, the inability of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to bring up the Labor and Human Resources appropriations bill. It is stopped, blocked, such that this body cannot—cannot—act upon that very important piece of legislation. The distinguished Senator from Massachusetts is the ranking member of that committee, and as such he is in a position to see that this piece of legislation could be brought forward.

This Senator is receiving reports this morning—and I called in as early as an hour ago to the CDC, the Centers for Disease Control, and to the facilities here in Maryland—as to what the impact is of this shutdown on those very important, ongoing health advisory services to all of our citizens, and I shall later in the day perhaps be able to advise the Senate. I heard that the CDC is not able to monitor the flu epidemic that is now in the United States.

So, Mr. President, I would hope that at some point, if the Senator from Massachusetts desires to return to the floor, that he might address this important issue. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could I have a minute to respond to the Senator from Virginia?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could get clarification, I would be glad to withhold so long as the Senator does not use a minute of my own time. Could we agree he have a minute, and then I have the time allocated to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time assignment to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I withhold until the Senator responds.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is so interesting to listen to my good friend and colleague cry crocodile tears for the Centers for Disease Control because in the very appropriations bill the Senator has talked about he would cut the Centers for Disease Control by a third and diminish its effectiveness to deal with these communicable diseases.

That is an issue we ought to be debating out here. The Senator knows we could pass that bill if it had not come with the unwarranted and unjustified positions that have been assumed by the majority in undermining a woman's right to choose and including striker replacement. Drop those, and it passes by a voice vote this afternoon, I say to the Senator.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

MISINFORMATION ABOUT THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased that there have been efforts at the White House, meetings between the President, the Vice President, and the leaders of Congress to try to find a solution to our budget problems. I know that sometimes they feel like they are trying to grasp for the wind. It is very difficult to find a solution, but it is a very, very important effort. I wish them continued encouragement in their efforts to find an agreement to the budget. I have been very much concerned that it does not seem like they are making that much progress.

The way you get a budget agreement, the way you get any agreement any time when you have two opposing

views is both sides have to give a little and get a little in return. I do not think that is happening yet. But I hope they will continue. I hope that something will happen, if they do not meet today, tomorrow, that dramatic progress will be made, although I know it will be very difficult.

Yesterday afternoon the President went on national television right before the bipartisan meeting on the budget to bemoan the partial shutdown of the Federal Government. He recited a list of horror stories about the disastrous effects of that shutdown.

He said, ''We ought to reopen the Government.'' I agree. He said, ''The shutdown has been especially devastating to hundreds of thousands of dedicated public servants who work for the American people through the Federal Government.'' I agree with that. He said, ''It's time to stop holding Federal workers hostage in this process.'' I agree with that too.

But that is the limit of my agreement with President Clinton. There is an awful lot of misunderstanding or misinformation that is being perpetrated on the American people about how we got into the situation we are in now.

Let us remember that the current shutdown is indeed partial because it does not effect any departments or agencies whose appropriations bills have been signed into law. I believe seven of them have been signed into law.

So the question is, why have not the remaining appropriations bills been signed into law? If they had been, we would not have the situation we have now.

There have been two major problems in getting those bills signed into law. One is the President himself. The second is the Democratic minority here in the Senate. Most of the President's tales of woe yesterday would not have been happening if the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill was signed into law. But we would not even pass it here in the Senate.

There is the problem. It is the Senate that has not acted. It is the minority in the Senate that has blocked the Labor-HHS, Education appropriations bill from even being considered. Keep in mind what has happened is that there is a threat to filibuster the motion to proceed because of some policy language that is in that Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. We are being told by the minority in the Senate you cannot even bring it up because of some of the provisions in this bill.

Why not? Let us bring it up. Let us have amendments. Let us debate them. Let us vote. Oh, no. The minority in the Senate, the Democrats in the Senate, have blocked even the consideration of this bill. Why? Because of striker replacement language that is in this bill where the President clearly, in my opinion, and I think some courts will eventually decide, has exceeded his authority with an Executive order on this subject. But the Democrats in the Senate will not even allow that bill to be brought up for consideration. Yet, they complain about how people are being affected by the fact that we do not have funding in this particular area.

Let us do something about it. Let us get the bill up. Let us go with the usual process around here, let us have votes. Some amendments will pass, some will not. Let us send it to the President and let him do what he will.

So we need to keep in mind exactly why some of these horror stories are happening. It is because the Democrats in the Senate will not even allow this appropriations bill to be brought up. So, you know, I am concerned about the Meals on Wheels Program, over Medicare contractors, over jobs that might be affected by this. The solution is to take this Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill up.

The responsibility is at least a shared one. The President had the temerity yesterday, for instance, to complain that the Environmental Protection Agency has been crippled by the shutdown. But who was it that vetoed the appropriations bill that had funding for the Environmental Protection Agency in it? President Clinton.

The President complained about the shutdown of emergency programs at FEMA. But who vetoed FEMA's appropriations bill? President Clinton vetoed that bill.

The President, with a straight face, complained about shutdowns at the State Department after he himself vetoed the State Department's appropriations bill. Oh, but he said he had his reasons for those vetoes, that he did not get everything he wanted in some of those bills.

Well, here is, in his own words, what he said about why he vetoed some of these bills. ''I will not sign any version of this bill,'' talking about the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations bill—and get that, ''any version''—''that does not fund the COPS initiative as a free-standing, discretionary grant program, as authorized.''

Translation: The Congress decided to fight crime by giving localities discretion in how they spend Federal aid. Mr. Clinton says it is his way or no way. He will shut down three critical Federal Departments unless he gets his COPS program the way he wants it.

We have three coequal branches of Government. The President cannot say, ''It's my way or no way.'' He has to work with the Congress, and he has to be sometime aware of what the courts have said.

But that is not all. He would keep those Departments shut down and their work force out on the street unless the Congress limits restrictions on the conduct of the Legal Services Corporation and its grantees, otherwise he cannot accept the appropriations bill. Funding is provided, services will be provided, but there are some restrictions on trying to control the excesses of the Legal Services Corporation. But he is ready to shut down all three of these big Departments and the agencies that are also affected by it because he cannot accept it the way it was written in the appropriations bill we sent him.

He said he ''cannot accept'' the money Congress wants to spend to keep the Commerce Department in operation and to keep the Justice Department in operation and to keep the State Department in operation unless we agree to pay for abortions for prison inmates.

Did you hear me? One of the 10 issues, I believe it was 10, that he listed why he vetoed that bill—actually it was 9 major issues—was because it had limits on abortions being paid for prisoners. The American people would not believe that. That was one of the main issues that he listed as to why he would veto that bill.

He said he cannot accept congressional funding for these three very important Departments as long as there is a moratorium—not a ban, mind you, just a moratorium—on future listings under the Endangered Species Act by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

There is a lot of feeling across America that the Endangered Species Act has gone too far, has been distorted, has gone from what was needed to ridiculous. I voted for the original Endangered Species Act, but I had no idea that it was going to get into a situation where an entire appropriations bill would be vetoed for the Interior Department because of objections relating to the marbled murrelet. The President lists as one of the seven major reasons why he vetoed the Department of Interior bill is because he did not like the objections regarding the marbled murrelet.

Do the American people know this? Would they be horrified if they realized that one of the major reasons the President vetoed an appropriations bill was because of this bird? I guess it is a bird. I do not think they would be very happy with that.

He had other reasons, as well, for closing down those three Departments. He opposes funding reductions in the Census Bureau. How many of you think the American people are all upset because there maybe is not enough funding in 1996 for the Census Bureau? Maybe it does deserve more, but that is what all this budget discussion is really about, I thought. If there is an agreement there would be some more funding provided for these things, then the changes would be made. But to veto the bill, and one of the major reasons listed for the veto of the Commerce, State, Justice Department bill was because he opposes cuts in the Census Bureau. I do not think there are a lot of American people really worrying about that.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question on that?

Mr. LOTT. Let me continue. I am about to get to the point where I can yield. Let me continue on my thought, if I can.

He is so devoted to the Commerce technology programs that he shut down the entire Department in order to preserve them. I do not understand the thinking.

The same holds true with the Interior and Energy Departments. The workers are idled because Mr. Clinton has two problems with the Interior appropriations bill. His first problem is he wants more money. Yes, that is the big part of it all, he wants more money for everything. I was looking over his objections on the Interior bill. He wants more money for DOE energy conservation, more money for Native American programs, more money for the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities.

That is the crux of all of it. We have a President for the first time in my memory, and I have been watching them pretty closely now for about 27 years, who is vetoing appropriations bills because they do not spend enough. Every other President I have ever watched, Democrat and Republican, vetoed appropriations bills because Congress could not control its insatiable appetite to spend more of the taxpayers' money. Now we have a President who says, ''I want more money'' and, in most cases, we are not talking about cuts in a lot of them, we are talking about controls on the rate of increases in these programs.

His second problem concerns provisions regarding certain environmental areas. The Tongass National Forest, the Columbia River Basin, the Mojave National Preserve. In the case of the Mojave National Preserve, as I understand it, he is mad because the responsibility would be shifted from the Park Service to the Bureau of Land Management. Is that enough reason to veto an appropriations bill for the Interior Department?

And in Tongass, he objects to clear cutting. As I understand the language in the bill, clear cutting is prohibited in there. He pointed out three technical concerns he had, basically technical. I think they can be worked out. I hope they will be, and I hope we can move this Interior Department appropriations bill forward.

The third vetoed appropriations bill would have funded the Veterans' Department, HUD, and several smaller agencies. President Clinton killed that funding and let those Departments and agencies close because Congress would not give him money for his pet projects, such as the National Service Program. As always, he wanted more of the public's money than Congress wanted to spend: More for EPA; more for the Council on Environmental Quality; more for something called Community Development Financial Institutions Program, and just generally more money.

He even vetoed the bill because Congress inserted a provision to stop the Secretary of the Veterans' Department from engaging in inappropriate political activity. He cited that as one of the reasons why he vetoed it.

So it goes on and on, Mr. President. I am afraid we have not done a very good job in explaining why we did some of the things we did in appropriations bills, but more importantly, explaining why the President vetoed them.

If I held up the list of the seven things that he cites as to why he vetoed the Interior appropriations bill—plus, of course, more money for everything—I do not believe the average American would agree with what he did. They would not think that a disagreement over whether some particular national preserve is controlled by the Park Service or the Bureau of Land Management is enough reason to veto the bill.

But I think we can find a solution. We will and we should try to pass these appropriations bills again with changes that have been suggested, sometimes by the President and sometimes by others. It has not been done before now partially because there was a thinking that there were serious budget negotiations underway and maybe some conclusion would be reached on the entitlements programs and on returning tax dollars to the people who pay the taxes and only appropriated accounts.

But since fast progress is not being made, at least we should go ahead and try to move some of these appropriations bills, individually or in a group, and allow the President to make up his own mind then whether or not he wants to veto them again. But if he does, the record will then be replete with evidence: The problem is not the Congress, the problem is the President, because we are going to give him another opportunity to consider these appropriations bills individually or perhaps even in a group.

Hopefully, we can come to an agreement. Hopefully, the budget discussions will bear real fruit. But it is going to take a lot more movement by the President than I have seen or I have read about in the press so far.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended until the hour of 1:30 p.m., with statements limited to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Maryland. I thank him for letting me complete my statement before he asked his question.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Interior bill permits clear cutting in the Tongass National Forest, I take it from the Senator's comments he would be opposed to it; is that correct?

Mr. LOTT. I think there should be language in the appropriations bill that would be—frankly, I hoped it would say there should not be clear cutting. I am not on the Appropriations Committee. I know they are working on that, and I think they will come up with language that will clarify that.

Mr. SARBANES. I take it from that response, if the President had a reasonably based concern that the bill would permit clear cutting, it would be a justified basis on which to veto the bill?

Mr. LOTT. I do not think so. Although I understand his concern and while I may have some agreement with him on it, to veto the entire Department of Interior appropriations bill over that one point would not be sufficient, in my mind, because you are talking about thousands of people being out of work, you are talking about monuments being closed down, parks being closed down.

That could have been clarified in other ways, through authorization, through other appropriation bills, and it would be coming very quickly.

Mr. SARBANES. That is what we did with Presidents Reagan and Bush. They would veto the bills, then we would try to accommodate their veto message and work out an understanding between the executive and legislative branches. But if that was not done immediately, we would provide a continuing resolution so the Government could function.

Mr. LOTT. If the Senator will yield on that, 2 years in a row in the Reagan administration, the Congress did not pass a single appropriations bill that was signed into law.

Mr. SARBANES. That is right, and——

Mr. LOTT. And the Democratic-controlled Congress passed continuing resolutions that had all 13 appropriations bills lumped into them—just lumped them into a pile along with the debt ceiling and everything, and left town and said to the President, ''Sign it.''

Mr. SARBANES. We reached agreement with the President, and the Government continued to function on the basis of the continuing resolution.

Now you have an instance in which you have just brought the Government to a partial shutdown by not providing a continuing resolution and not working out the differences that were connected with the veto of the appropriations bills.

The Senator mentioned the Bureau of the Census, and he sort of dismissed it. The United States has done a decennial census every year since 1790. That was when the first census was done. We have done a census every 10 years since then. Does the Senator think that we should do a decennial census in the year 2000?

Mr. LOTT. Well, I would want to think about that and make sure I gave you a fully informed answer. I think the answer is probably yes. But we are not talking about not funding the Census Bureau; we are talking about the level of funding for the Census Bureau 4 years from when this decennial census will occur, and also when it involved vetoing an entire Department's appropriations bill. I do not think that

because the President did not get all the funds he wanted, that is enough to veto the State, Commerce, Justice appropriations bill.

Mr. SARBANES. I say to the Senator that the President had other reasons as well. But since you focused on the Bureau of Census, unless the Census Bureau gets additional funds now to begin the work that needs to be done to do the decennial census in the year 2000, they will not be able to do it.

Mr. LOTT. But you cannot be concerned here about Meals on Wheels, other Federal programs, and monuments being closed and, on the other hand, say, ''I am vetoing the bill because you do not give me all of the funding I want for the Census Bureau or for the National Endowment programs.'' This process could still go forward. My point is that the President vetoed these bills, in my opinion, on questionable grounds that put all of these Federal workers out of work.

We passed one continuing resolution, I remind the Senator from Maryland, and I was involved in the discussions and suggested some language that helped move that continuing resolution through right before Thanksgiving, with the idea that there would be sufficient time for us to get an agreement on our budget before Christmas. It did not happen. We still do not have one. The President signed into law a commitment to have a balanced budget in 7 years, using CBO numbers or real numbers, which still has not happened.

So the Congress, frankly, is concerned about sending another CR down there that would extend the time without knowing what the result is going to be. By the way, how much time does it take? The President has known for weeks, for months, that we were moving toward a balanced budget in 7 years, yet he did not really get engaged until actually right before Christmas. But it is time that we get an agreement. If we get an agreement, then all these other problems will fall by the wayside.

What we are trying to do is get a solution that controls the rate of growth in the explosive Federal Government spending for the sake of our children's future. That is what I worry about. I worry about this $185,000-plus a year in interest on the national debt that every child owes when they are born. How are we going to control this? That is what is really at stake.

Mr. SARBANES. Can I ask what the time situation is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Mississippi has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I think I have made my point for now. I am sure we will have continuing discussions. I think we can find solutions if men of good will are willing work together and try to find a way to work out the disagreements and come to the conclusion and pass these bills. I do not see why it could not be done quickly. I certainly hope it will be.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I want to make this observation about the comments of the Senator from Mississippi. Never before has the Congress used as a coercive tactic to close down the Government in order to try to gain its way for a fundamental change——

Mr. LOTT. Is it not true that, in 1987, I believe, the Democratic-controlled Congress passed a CR that had every appropriations bill, debt ceiling, and a number of other issues, and left town and said to the President, ''Sign it and keep the Government operating, or veto it and shut it down.''? And they were gone. Did that happen or not?

Mr. SARBANES. The President could have called the Congress back. The Congress gave him a CR so the Government could continue to function. Now what is happening is, for the first time ever, the Congress is refusing to provide a CR and use that as a coercive tactic in the bargaining. That is an irresponsible and, in my view, impermissible action. That is what is happening.

We did not close the Government down with respect to the Republican Presidents. We let the Government go on to function.

Mr. LOTT. The Government has been closed down before during Democratic administrations. This is not new. We have had budget disagreements every year for the last 15 years.

Mr. SARBANES. The Government has been closed down for 19 days.

Mr. LOTT. I know it has been done for at least 11 days, as I remember. I do not remember the other times, but we have had these shutdowns before.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, reclaiming my time, I want to answer that point. There were periods before the Civiletti decision in 1980 in which the Government continued to function without an appropriations bill because there was not a ruling that under the Antideficiency Act, the Government could not go on functioning. So we did not have an appropriations bill, but the Government continued to function.

Then we had this ruling that you are not allowed to do that. Subsequent to that, we had maybe a day, or a weekend, or something, in which there would be a gap in between having an appropriation bill, and either getting an appropriation or getting a continuing resolution. This is the first time, clearly, in which an extended period has been allowed to develop as a coercive tactic in closing down the Government.

You cannot find a previous instance—you can find instances before the Civiletti opinion in which departments continued to function without an appropriations bill, but there was then a ruling that said such functioning ran counter to the Antideficiency Act. You can then find instances after the Civiletti opinion in which you had a period of a day or two or a weekend in which that was the case. But we never had an instance, as we have now experienced, where we have had 6 days earlier in 1995 and now we have run for 19 days and where it is clearly admitted that this is being used as a coercive tactic.

My distinguished colleagues in the House have been very explicit about the fact that they will, as they say, create a ''titanic legislative standoff'' with President Clinton. Others have said openly that they intended to bring the Government to a halt, to have a closedown, in order to provoke a controversy.

My very basic point is that this is irresponsible. It has not been done in the past. It represents, I think, an abuse of the constitutional arrangements of power, and it ought to cease.

I yield the floor.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have heard, during the course of the morning, that this is really just a question about the various funding and how we will be able to get the resources to be able to move toward a balanced budget. I think it is important that as we see this process hopefully move forward, that the American people are going to understand the various options which we can take that make that progress.

I want to address the Senate on the fairness issue in reaching the balanced budget, because I think all of us know if it was just a question of figures, anyone could reach the balanced budget by slashing, burning and ending various kinds of programs. The question is, how are we going to reach that objective and do it in a way that will be fair, meeting the standard of fairness to the American people. I think it will only be if the proposal that is agreed on, and hopefully it will be agreed on by the Congress and by the President, will meet that standard of fairness, and will be acceptable by the American people. That is a fair test.

I want to address the Senate for a few moments this afternoon on a very important aspect of what I think is the issue of fairness. The original Republican budget plan was properly vetoed by the President because it failed to meet this test of fairness. It inflicted deep cuts in Medicare, Medicaid, education, the environment, and other important national priorities, and included large tax breaks for wealthy individuals and corporations.

Half of all the spending cuts in the Republican plan came from the bottom 20 percent of families in America while only 9 percent of the cuts came from the top 20 percent of families in America. Two-thirds of the tax breaks in the Republican plan go to the same top 20 percent of Americans, while the bottom 20 percent would face a tax increase. The middle 60 percent of Americans would also be hit unfairly. They would lose an average of $600 each because of the spending cuts, and get back only a third of that amount in tax reductions.

In order to have a fair balanced budget, every form of spending should be on the table. By the year 2002, the largest of all entitlement programs will be tax entitlements. It is not going to be the Census Bureau, it is not going to be the NEA, it will not be education, it is not going to be the environmental cleanup, it is going to be tax entitlements. Between now and the year 2002, the Federal Government will spend over $4 trillion in tax loopholes and tax preferences which go disproportionately to wealthy individuals and corporations. In 2002, these tax entitlements will represent a larger share of the budget than Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid or any of the other entitlement programs. So far, out of the $4 trillion of tax entitlements, the Republicans are willing to cut only $16 billion. Out of the $4.3 trillion, they are prepared to cut $16 billion.

A recent article in the Wall Street Journal cited the increasing disparity of the tax burden between individuals and corporations. The journal cites Treasury Department figures that corporate taxes in 1993 accounted for only 10 percent of the total Federal tax collections. In 1960, that figure was 23 percent. The proportion of taxes paid by corporate America has decreased by more than half at the same time the corporate profits have soared and wages have remained stagnant.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986, the most recent comprehensive reform of our Tax Code, was enacted to provide greater equity in the tax burden by eliminating corporate loopholes. The statistics compiled by the Office of Management and Budget suggest this has had limited effect. Mr. President, this chart is effectively summarizing what was in the Wall Street Journal article about a week ago about what has happened with tax fairness, and corporations versus families. Here we find where the American families, working families, individuals, and individual families have been with respect to tax revenues, and where the burden has fallen.

What have we seen over the period of the last years? Constant reduction in terms of corporate participation. It is now just about a third of what it was back some 30 years ago. Basically, that has been because of the escalation of the various tax expenditures and tax loopholes. What do our Republican friends want to do in their budget? They want to provide greater kinds of benefits to the corporations and wealthiest individuals, and increase—increase—the taxes on the working families, on the neediest working families in this country.

I wish when we listen to our good Republican friends that are talking about how the President wants to spend a little more on the Census Bureau and how he wants to do a little more on the environment, that we would realize that their arguments would have a lot more power if they explained why they want to have $245 billion in tax breaks, which is their latest offer, saying they will not support any kind of budget unless it has that $245 billion—again, it is the corporations who have been gradually paying less and less of their fair share of the load.

We hear a lot about people being in the wagon and out of the wagon, paying their fair share of the load. What we have seen, Mr. President, is over the period of these years right up until now, the gradual reduction in the corporations' participation because of the whole range of different tax expenditures.

Let me just describe briefly a few of those. Again, this is occurring because the Tax Code is still rife with loopholes through which this country's major corporations jump with ease. The General Accounting Office has reported that in 1991, 73 percent of foreign-based corporations doing business in the United States pay no Federal income taxes. More than 60 percent of U.S.-based companies paid no U.S. income taxes. Not only are the foreign corporations not paying any, what we have devised in the Tax Code are provisions which are encouraging these corporations to move jobs overseas taking jobs away from Americans. We give them tax benefits if they take the jobs away from hard-working Americans who are already paying their fair share, to move them overseas. We found that when the President in the last Congress closed down one of the principal loopholes, no sooner had it been closed down than under the Republican program it has opened up again.

Companies still have a significant incentive to minimize the calculation of their U.S. income, and therefore their U.S. taxation. They shift income away from the United States and shift deductible expenses into the United States. In fact, these corporate tax loopholes encourage companies to move plants and jobs overseas to low-tax havens. Our Tax Code promotes the wage stagnation caused by the exodus of good manufacturing jobs.

Surely, if elderly couples depending on Medicare and having an average income of less than $17,000 a year would be required by the Republican plan to pay an additional $2,500 in Medicare premiums to balanced the budget over the next 7 years, corporations can be asked to contribute their fair share.

If 4 million children would lose their health care and 5 million senior citizens and disabled Americans would lose their Medicaid protection to balance the budget, corporations can be asked to bear their fair share. Surely, if education funding would be cut by 30 percent and millions of college students would have the cost of their student loans increased to a point where they may no longer be able to afford college, corporations can be asked to bear their fair share.

Here are several approaches to make this work. First, the Republican plan would provide a reduction of 17 percent in the Federal budget over the next 7 years, exclusive of defense spending and Social Security. Reducing the $4 trillion in tax subsidies by 17 percent would achieve savings of $680 billion.

If we applied the 17-percent reduction to only one-quarter of the tax expenditures, we would save $170 billion—more than enough to provide the additional savings needed in the current impasse to balance the budget fairly in 7 years. Surely it makes sense to reduce corporate subsidies by a similar percentage as programs that benefit working Americans and the poor are being cut.

As a second approach, a number of specific corporate loopholes that are contrary to sensible national policy could be eliminated entirely to achieve the needed savings. It would make sense under this approach to focus specifically on tax subsidies that have the direct or indirect affect of encouraging American businesses to move transactions and jobs overseas. It is particularly offensive, at a time when large numbers of American workers are losing their jobs and being dislocated by changes in the economy, that the Tax Code is subsidizing corporations to move transactions and jobs overseas.

Here are examples of some of the most egregious corporate tax expenditures:

Runaway plants—$8 billion over 7 years: The Tax Code now encourages U.S. firms to move abroad. A manufacturing plant that moves overseas can defer its taxes on profits until those profits are repatriated to the United States. As a result, much of these profits never come back to the United States. Unlike all other taxpayers, these multinational companies are not required to pay taxes at the time of the gain.

Closing this egregious loophole would eliminate an $8 billion giveaway over 7 years. Yet, legislation proposed to address this specific issue was rejected by the Senate earlier this year on a party line vote.

As a result, foreign subsidiaries can accrue big profits abroad, stash the money in foreign bank accounts, and not pay any U.S. taxes on them.

In a related matter, the President and Congress took action in 1993 to close an additional loophole that provides incentives to companies to move jobs overseas. The Republicans now want to reopen that loophole, and have done so in their budget plan.

Over the course of the past 15 years, the United States lost 3 million manufacturing jobs. Fifty percent of these jobs have been lost in the last 5 years alone. These jobs were being lost at the same time that U.S.-owned subsidiaries were locating plants in tax haven countries across the globe.

Closing these loopholes is a win-win for the American worker and the American taxpayer. U.S. companies will no longer have the same incentive to move U.S. jobs overseas and at the same time we can reduce the Federal deficit.

Transfer pricing—$35–$40 billion annually: Companies have a significant

incentive to minimize their U.S.-based income, and therefore their U.S. taxes. Therefore, they shift income away from the United States and shift tax-deductible expenses into the United States. Plain and simple, it's cooking the books, shifting costs from one part of the company to another for tax purposes, or transfer pricing.

IBM, for example, was fortunate enough to accumulate $25 billion in U.S. sales in 1987. That same year, its 1987 annual report stated that one third of its worldwide profits were earned by its U.S. operations. Clearly, its U.S. operations appeared profitable and successful. Yet, its tax return reported almost no U.S. earnings.

A recent study asserts that transfer pricing could cost as much as $35 to $40 billion annually. The Multi-State Tax Commission has stated that it is at least a $2 billion a year problem, and that only includes foreign-based companies doing business in the United States. And there are far more U.S.-based companies with foreign operations than foreign-based companies with U.S. operations.

And this is not the result of tax policy that is intended to spur U.S. investment. In contrast, it is revenue lost directly as a result of multinational companies fixing the books to minimize their U.S. tax liability.

This is not a new problem with which we are dealing. To the contrary, we have been trying to close this loophole for almost 20 years. Back in 1978, when we debated the United States–United Kingdom tax treaty, we spent a substantial amount of time on this issue. We knew then, as we know now, that it was a loophole that necessitated action. The only difference now is that it is a much bigger problem, more pervasive, and more costly to the Federal Treasury.

States have responded to this problem by requiring companies to proportion their costs and profits according to employees, payroll, and other standards. We can do the same.

And even more troubling is the fact that this is not a single loophole that exists by itself for multinational corporations. There are others, such as tax credits provided to U.S. companies for tax payments made to foreign countries by their subsidiaries, or tax deferrals for U.S. companies on income of foreign operations that are not repatriated to this country.

Title passage—$16 billion over 7 years: Another tax loophole for multinational corporations is the so-called inventory property sales source rule. Large multinational exporting corporations are able to sell goods abroad and avoid U.S. taxes through some fancy footwork during the export process. This provision allows multinational corporations to shift sales to overseas operations, eliminating taxation in this country.

This loophole was closed by both the House and the Senate in the 1986 tax reform process, but was reopened in conference. Treasury has estimated that if we eliminated it altogether, as we tried to do in 1986, we would generate as much as $16 billion.

Let's look at an example. Company X is shipping out some products to a foreign country. Under normal circumstances, that shipment would pay taxes to the United States. But under a special rule, that company passes title to the products out on the high seas, thereby avoiding all Federal taxes. This is equivalent to a tax exemption that disproportionately benefits upper income individuals.

Some people will say that we are taking steps that will hurt exports and the expansion of our markets that can create new jobs for the economy. But we are only closing an unnecessary loophole that is prevalent because companies are willing to pass title of property in the middle of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

Foreign sales corporations—$9.4 billion over 7 years: An additional tax break is provided to companies through paper transactions. It is called the foreign sales corporation loophole, and provides exporters with the opportunity to exempt a portion of their export income from U.S. taxation.

A company does not have to increase its export activity, increase its payroll, or even increase its own production in the United States. It only has to set up a foreign sales corporation on paper. It can then exempt up to 30 percent of its export income from taxes. The Joint Tax Committee estimates that the closure of this loophole would raise $9.4 billion in new revenue over the 7-year budget period.

Capital gains tax reduction: Whether we agree or disagree about its merits, do any of us really believe that it should be retroactive to January 1, 1995?

Is that fair? To give new tax breaks to wealthy individuals retroactively while we also cut important programs for our working families?

Billionaires' loophole: We still haven't closed the so-called billionaires' loophole. On April 6, we voted 96–4 to close it up tight, and the Senate Finance Committee has closed it twice now. But every time it goes to conference, it gets opened up.

This is a tax loophole that exists for billionaires who renounce their American citizenship to avoid millions and even billions of dollars in taxes on income, capital gains, gifts, and estates.

The law would not prevent individuals from shifting both their assets and their citizenship to a foreign country. Rather, it would just make sure that those who have amassed great wealth through the U.S. economic system pay their fair share of taxes.

Last year, approximately 850 individuals renounced their citizenship, but only a handful of those would be affected by this legislation. The tax loophole only applies to those with a minimum $600,000 in unrealized gains, which generally would necessitate a minimum $5 million net worth. All those without that level of liability can renounce their citizenship without the IRS ever questioning their motives.

This loophole allows an individual to enjoy all the benefits of the United States, including its stature as an economic engine for the world, grow rich because of it, and then expatriate without being taxed on the wealth generated in this country. This tax break costs the taxpayers $3.6 billion over 10 years.

It is not even a slap on the wrist. It is barely enough to close the loophole that permits American billionaires to renounce their citizenship and take up their residency overseas in order to escape American taxes.

Unbelievable. We passed the amendment here on the floor of the U.S. Senate by over 90 votes, saying: When you go to the conference on those budgets, pull that Benedict Arnold proposal out of that budget.

Those doors were not even closed over there when out it came again, right out again. No wonder the President vetoed that particular budget. Who wants to be associated with saying to a superwealthy American, ''Renounce your citizenship and escape all the taxes for the moneys you have earned in the United States''? That provision is still in there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

The Senator from Mississippi.

WHO SPEAKS FOR THE TAXPAYER?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will be brief because I have spoken earlier. I see there is another Senator wishing to speak. But I would like to respond directly to some of the comments just made with regard to taxes. I will hold it down. We are trying to go back and forth.

Mr. President, there is a lot of complaining about tax cuts in the budget negotiations. I ask the question again, who, here, is going to speak for the taxpayers of America? There are a lot of Americans out there getting up every morning at 5 o'clock, going to work, pulling their share of the load, paying taxes. They think a little more fairness in the Tax Code, a little incentive to save, a little incentive for growth in the economy to create jobs is a good idea. Everybody around here seems to be worried about this program or that program, this welfare program, that program. What about the people who are paying the taxes on all these programs? Why do they not get a little help?

As I understand it, one of the points that was indirectly referred to was the earned income tax credit. I do not know much about what has been going on in the budget negotiations at the White House, but I understand that is one area where they are very close to agreement.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. LOTT. The earned income tax credit program is one that most of us have supported in the past. The problem has been it has exploded, like so many Federal programs. Now, I understand, people who have an income of up to $30,000 a year are getting a tax credit. We are not saying eliminate it. We are not saying wipe it out. We are saying control the explosive growth, make sure it is applicable and provided to those who are at the low-income, entry level, and not begin to move it on up into the beginnings of middle-income people.

Another point, let us talk about the specifics of the tax proposals. I have asked this question here on the floor and nobody has really responded to it.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could I ask the Senator this question, why is the Senator——

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I yield for a question.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why is the Senator so concerned about providing some offset for the EITC program, for the increases in the Social Security and the excise taxes and other FICA taxes, for families that are making $30,000, yet so unwilling to try to provide also some belt tightening for those who are making $400,000? I have not heard the Senator talk about that. I am stunned by his silence. I am sure he is going to address that issue. That is what this is about.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time belongs to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. LOTT. I would ask this of the Senator, is he opposed to eliminating the marriage penalty in the Tax Code? For years we have talked about the unfairness of the marriage penalty. That is one of the things we propose to eliminate, and it is not cheap. It costs a good bit of money. Why should a couple living apart pay more when they get married, under the Tax Code, even though they are making the same money?

Who among us opposes the option of the spousal IRA, the spouse working in the home being able to have an individual retirement account? I do not think anybody is opposed to that. Most of us would like to see the IRA expanded because we would like to encourage savings. When we had the individual retirement account provisions in the 1980's it worked. It encouraged people to save. Part of what is going on in these negotiations would allow for an expansion of IRA and then allow it to be used for education and for medical purposes. I think those are good ideas.

And should we not allow for changes in the estate taxes so people who have small farms and small businesses do not wind up having to sell the farms that have been in their families for years to pay for the estate taxes—how in the world did we ever get in a position of taxing death, anyway? I think most American people would like to receive some relief there, whether they are wealthy or poor, frankly.

Also, you want to help families, a family of four? How about helping them by allowing them to keep a little of their own money with a tax credit for children? We are trying to encourage and help families with children provide for their own needs, and not everybody just look to the Federal Government to do it for them.

Yes, the capital gains tax rate cut. This is something most people will acknowledge, if it is done properly, will encourage growth in the economy and the creation of jobs. Even the President has said as much. He has said that if other tax provisions can be worked out, and the spending disagreements can be worked out, that this is something that he could support.

So it is one thing to bash the tax cuts en bloc, but when you take it apart and look at what is in the package that passed the Congress overwhelmingly, there is an awful lot of good in there. I hope it will remain in the final package.

Maybe the magic number is not 240 or 245, maybe it is less than that. But I think we need to look at the specifics of what we are trying to do and who we are trying to help in the economy. If we need to make changes to make sure it is directed more to the middle-income families, fine. I would support that. I think that is the way the talks will eventually go.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before I yield the floor I yield for a question.

Mr. SARBANES. Yesterday AT&T announced they were going to fire 30,000 people. Why in the world would you cut the taxes, in some instances in half, on the CEO's getting the stock options, who are not on their way out the door, and then turn to these fired, these families who have been fired, and say it is going to be harder for you to get a tuition loan to send your son and daughter to college. Or, if they are——

Mr. LOTT. It is not going to be harder for them to get a tuition loan.

Mr. SARBANES. Low-income people, they are not going to get the tax credit.

Mr. LOTT. Everybody who wants to go to college will be able to get a loan or grant or work-study program or scholarship. They will be able to go to college in America.

Mr. SARBANES. Not under the plan you put forward. You are cutting back on that.

You are having senior citizens finding themselves unable to get medical care and, at the same time you are doing all this, you are going to give a big tax break.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I reclaim my time. If the Senator is going to make that kind of statement about what we are going to do, throwing senior citizens off of Medicare, that is just not the case. It is not the intent and it would not be the result.

As a matter of fact, I think the Senator from Maryland knows that in the alternative budget that has been proposed by the majority in Congress, more money is added back for education. Even these direct loans are being increased.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield on the issue of education?

Mr. LOTT. I still maintain, when you look at the Federal programs we have with the NDSL, the Pell grants, the other grants, the myriad of programs to help people who want to go to college, the money is there for people that need it. The only ones who may not be getting enough help are those in the upper-middle-income category that cannot qualify for the loans or the grants.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, could I ask, just on that question——

Mr. LOTT. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why does the Senator, who believes in competition and also in choice, why does he defend the Republican position in insisting that students get their aid and assistance through colleges through the guaranteed loan program, which provides, over the period of the next 7 years, a guaranteed profit of between $7 and $9 billion over that period to the banks in this country, rather than letting the college and the student make their choice whether they want that or the direct loan program?

Mr. LOTT. Let the Government do it. That is always the answer. Let the Federal Government become the lender of first resort.

Mr. KENNEDY. Why not let the schools and students choose the loan program that provides the best services at the lowest cost, rather than writing in, as the Republicans have done, an arbitrary cap on direct loans?

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I reclaim my time to say this. The answer is always let Uncle Sam give the money, direct the money, loan the money. I say the private sector can do it and they will do a better job of collecting the loans that are owed than the Federal Government. The Federal Government has a terrible record in collecting money that is owed on these loans that have been made.

I say we should have a greater emphasis on loans, as a matter of fact. I have always supported the NDSL Program. But now we are going to a program that, in my opinion, is going to wind up costing a whole lot more and, for a lot of kids in the future who will need that help, the money will not be there to help them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, we have heard some very interesting comments by the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Maryland, and the Senator from Massachusetts, debating what the provisions of the Federal

budget should be. Each Senator has his own views. That is a very important debate. I personally fall on the side of the Senator from Maryland and the Senator from Massachusetts, in saying this budget proposed by the Republican majority is unfair. It creates too much of a burden on middle-income people, on low-income people, and shifts the benefit to the most wealthy. It is just basically unfair. But, Mr. President, I stand here to address another issue.

While we are here debating what the provisions of the Federal budget should be, many—tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of innocent Americans—are suffering because the Government is shut down and because innocent Americans, whether they are working for the Federal Government or not, are bearing the brunt of this shutdown. It is wrong. It is absolutely wrong. We should put people back to work.

The burden of this debate should not fall on innocent Americans, and it is now falling on innocent Americans because the House majority and the Speaker of the House are in a willful band over there and are not letting American Federal employees go back to work.

It is a very interesting debate we have heard from the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Massachusetts, and the Senator from Maryland. It is very interesting. Let us have this debate. Let us work on the budget. Let us work on the provisions. But, in the meantime, let us put Americans back to work, and let us take the burden off of innocent Americans.

Today, once again, most of the employees of the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the VA hospitals, the State Department, and many other parts of our Government will stay home and the rest will work without pay.

Small businesses will go without Government contracts as their rent and utility bills are coming due.

People on Indian reservations will have to go without heating assistance money as a blizzard now sweeps across the Great Plains during the coldest weeks of the year.

Gas stations in rural areas that depend on their customers in the Forest Service will lose more of their business.

Families will lose there housing deposits. Why? Because the VA cannot process home loans.

I am here to say that it is an outrage. I spent last Monday walking down Route I–94 through Miles City, close to where you, Mr. President, reside. That is the State you represent. I heard from people who do not know how they will pay their heating bills, and others who had counted on a day snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park. I have heard the same outrage from people in our State who are unable to go snowmobiling in Yellowstone National Park. Excuse my language, but they are mad as hell, and they are right to be mad as hell.

Listen to a letter I got last week from a fellow who works in the park.

> I work here in Yellowstone National park in the fleet Maintenance Division as a mechanic. The job I currently hold has been the best one I've ever held. I've held this permanent position since the 25th of September, 1989. As you very well know, the National Park Service is currently in the middle of the budget crisis. This stalemate has got to stop now, due to the fact that the main concessionaire, TW Recreational Services, has been considering shutting the season down because they cannot maintain the number of employees to wait out this ''Mexican Standoff'' and may have to abandon the rest of the season.
>
> Not only that, the gateway communities of the Park are currently losing capital and are trying to survive the lost income all because you people decided to ''flex'' your muscle and keep the National Park Service shut down.

Now hear an e-mail I received just this morning from a woman who works in Hamilton:

> As a non-tenured, furloughed staff scientist at the Rocky Mountain Labs, NIH, Hamilton Montana, I am feeling this quite acutely, both financially and professionally.

Or listen to the folks at the Gardiner Chamber of Commerce:

> Gardiner is the north entrance to Yellowstone Park. The economy is almost entirely dependent on visitors to Yellowstone. With Yellowstone closed the last three weeks, the cost to our small community of 1,500 is not less than $1.5 million in private sector gross receipts.

Mr. President, you heard that right. Since last December, Gardiner has lost $1,000 for every single resident—innocent people, while we here debate. It is wrong.

Mr. President, it is an outrage. Whatever one's views on the budget, it is wrong and has to stop. It is wrong that innocent people suffer, whether they are furloughed Federal employees or other Americans who feel the brunt of it, while we in the Congress debate the budget.

I want to commend our majority leader for doing what is right and getting the Senate to do its part by passing a bill to keep the Government open. That was a tough decision. He has been roundly criticized for it. But it was the right thing to do.

Now it is up to Speaker GINGRICH and the House. Up to now, they have flat-out refused to do what is right. They have flat-out refused to take the burden off of innocent Americans. They are the holdouts. Yesterday, they voted to keep hurting the small businesses outside Yellowstone, keep the people on the Fort Peck Reservation and our other reservations waiting for their heating assistance, keep people at home or working without pay.

Why did they do it? Well, they have ideas that they want the President to accept on the budget. Maybe they believe they get some leverage over the President with this, or think they have some political advantage when all of this is ended. That might be so. I have ideas that I would like the President to accept on the budget, too. But I am not going to punish innocent people just because I want my views adopted.

The fact is, you should not do things that you know are wrong. It is that simple. It is the very first moral lesson we learn as children. You should not do things you know are wrong.

You should not make families on the Fort Peck Reservation go without heating in the coldest part of winter.

You should not threaten the jobs of auto mechanics and scientific researchers.

You should not threaten to make small businesses close their doors because they have no money to pay the rent.

You should not hurt innocent, hard-working people.

So I have come down here to the floor, Mr. President, just to say to the Speaker and to the folks in the House, do what you know is right. Pass the resolution. Put folks back to work. Take the burden off of them so that we in both Houses of Congress, along with the President, can do the Nation's work and pass the 7-year balanced budget resolution.

Let us debate the provisions of it, but let us not in the meantime put the burden on innocent Americans. Mr. Speaker, and all of the Republicans in the House, I urge you to do what you know is right. Pass the resolution and put the people back to work.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SARBANES addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

THE BUDGET

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, just a couple of days ago Ellen Goodman wrote a very interesting column entitled ''Bootstraps for Middle-Aged Children,'' and she addressed the problem that would confront the elderly and their children if the budget is cut according to the Republican budget proposal. She made the point that middle-aged children may get a small tax cut of less than $1 a day and a nursing home bill of $35,000 a year for their parents if some of these Medicaid cuts go through.

Actually, the fact is that Medicaid now pays for 60 percent of nursing home care. The elderly are required to use up their own assets until they get down to a level where they qualify for Medicaid. These are middle-income people who are, in effect, by their health situation, forced to use up their assets in order to meet their medical needs, and then Medicaid covers for them. If Medicaid ceases to do that, the burden is going to come back upon their children.

I think if people ask themselves carefully, ''Which would you rather do, forego a small tax benefit or keep the protection against the extraordinary costs of nursing home care?'' they would want to be protected against the nursing home costs.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Sun, Jan. 3, 1996]

BOOTSTRAPS FOR MIDDLE-AGED CHILDREN

(By Ellen Goodman)

BOSTON.—This one is for Priscilla Parten, the Derry, N.H., woman who had the temerity to ask Lamar Alexander who would care for the elderly if the budget is cut according to the GOP pattern.

The answer from the presidential candidate, one of the men hawking their wares across New Hampshire was that ''We're going to have to accept more personal responsibility in our own families for reading to our children and caring for our parents, and that's going to be inconvenient and difficult.''

Happy New Year, Priscilla and open up your calendar. Scribble down two rather large words under 1996: Personal Responsibility. They're going to be the watchwords of the 1996 campaign.

Personal Responsibility is the catchall moral phrase uttered by politicians in favor of removing the guaranteed safety net and parceling the money out in incredibly shrinking block grants to the states. It's the all-purpose ethical disclaimer for those who equate the task of caring for the elderly sick with ''reading to children,'' for those who blithely describe eldercare as ''inconvenient'' or ''difficult'' but character-building.

To know what they have in mind, get past the P.R. campaign and go to the fine print of the GOP's Medicaid Transformation Act of 1995. That's the Orwellian title for the bill that would ''transform'' Medicaid by eliminating its guarantee.

From the day Medicaid is block-granted, adult children earning more than the national median income—that's $31,000 a year per household—may be held responsible for the bill if their parents are in a nursing home. If they don't pay up, these newly defined Deadbeat Kids may find a lien put on their incomes, their houses, their savings.

A secret of the current system is that Medicaid, the health program established for the poor and their children, now pays for 60 percent of nursing-home care. That's because nursing care eats up the assets of elders at a rate of about $35,000 a year until they are indigent.

Not surprisingly, the folks calling for Personal Responsibility draw on examples of personal irresponsibility to justify a change that is beginning to make middle-class eyes widen. They point to elderly millionaires who deliberately transfer their assets to the kids in order to go on the dole in nursing homes. They describe deadbeat kids who callously drop their parents at the government door and go off to the Bahamas.

THE ONES WHO WILL SUFFER

But if and when states begin sending bills to the kids, those folks aren't the ones who'll suffer. Thousands of middle-aged ''children'' of the 3 million elders in nursing homes may have to pay for their parents out of their children's education fund and their own retirement savings. Adult children, perhaps elders themselves, may have to choose between nursing sick parents at home or emptying the bank.

How neglectful are we, anyway? Despite the bad P.R. we are getting, families do not by and large look to nursing homes for their parents until they are overwhelmed. Elders do not, by and large, go there until they are too ill to be cared for at home. Only one-fifth of the disabled elderly are in nursing homes.

Daughters and daughters-in-law provide most of the care of elders and they will shoulder the increased Personal Responsibility at the cost of their jobs, their pensions, their own old age. The daughter of a disabled 88-year-old may, after all, be 66 herself. It is their characters that will be built on deteriorating lives. One politician's social issue is another woman's life.

There is enough guilt in every family to trip the responsibility wire, to push the button that says families should take care of their own. As a political slogan, P.R. passes what Dan Yankelovich calls the ''they have a point'' test.

But there is an awful lot of Personal Responsibility going around already. As educational loans are cut we are told to be responsible for our own children. As company pensions are fading, we are told to be responsible for our own retirement. At the same time we are to be responsible for disabled parents and even grandparents.

Dear Priscilla, when the politicians up there start talking about Personal Responsibility, they mean our responsibility, not theirs. The GOP Congress isn't just trying to balance the budget. They want to end the idea of government as an agent of mutual responsibility.

This is what you get in return for a safety net: a pair of bootstraps, a middle-class tax cut of less than a dollar a day and, oh yes, a nursing-home bill of $35,000 a year.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF WETLANDS

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, for years, I have tried to reform the way our Federal Government protects wetlands. The current system is bureaucratic and cumbersome; it is full of delay, waste, and uncertainty. I believe that wetlands should be protected. I believe that the Federal Government should continue to have an important role. But clearly, whatever is done to address the outstanding questions surrounding the Federal regulation of wetlands, the system must be streamlined. This is not radical or extreme. It is not even partisan. If one is not an employee of the Environmental Protection Agency or if one is not a K-Street concrete environmentalist, streamlining makes sense. Streamlining is a bipartisan issue. Depending on which day one decides to listen to the President, he believes in streamlining.

Senators may remember the National Performance Review to re-invent Government making Government work better and cost less. We have been told that the administration wants to make the Government user friendly, that it wants to streamline and reduce duplication and waste.

Our goal is to make the entire Federal Government both less expensive and more efficient, and to change the culture of our national bureaucracy away from complacency and entitlement toward initiative and empowerment. We intend to redesign, to reinvent, to reinvigorate the entire national government.

This is President Clinton on March 3, 1993. He also said:

It is time the Federal Government follow the example set by the most innovative State and local leaders and by the many huge private sector companies that have had to go through the same sort of searching reexamination over the last decade, companies that have downsized and streamlined and become more customer-friendly and, as a result, have had much, much more success.

Apparently, Vice President GORE also believes in streamlining and reinventing Government. On that same day, Vice President GORE said:

It's time we cut the red tape and trimmed the bureaucracy, and it's time we took out of our vocabulary the words, 'Well, we've always done it that way.

The Vice President also requested action from citizens and policymakers.

Help us get rid of the waste and inefficiency. Help us get rid of unnecessary bureaucracy. Let us know when you spot a problem and tell us when you've got an idea.

I have spotted a problem and I have an idea. Outside of Washington, this is common sense. The problem is that we have multiple agencies doing the same thing with regard to wetlands. My idea was to eliminate just a fraction of the existing redundancy in wetlands regulation. The Clinton administration already has employees at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers who have had the lead in making permitting decisions on wetlands for 20 years. The Clinton administration also has employees at the Environmental Protection Agency which oversee the same permitting decisions. My idea is that one team of professionals should be enough. If it is not enough, then we have more management problems than a National Performance Review could remedy.

I included a provision in the VA–HUD appropriations bill which removes EPA's duplicative authority to veto corps-issued permits. According to the corps, there is no other Federal regulatory program that gives two Federal agencies decisional authority over the same Federal permit of action. The corps has been the lead agency in wetlands protection for almost 20 years and it simply cannot be demonstrated that we need to hire one set of bureaucrats to second-guess what the first set of bureaucrats is hired to do in the first place. We are here today to balance a budget. To balance a budget, tough choices must be made. Eliminating redundant activities is an easy choice. It is common sense. Leave it to the environmental lobbyists to argue that we need two or more different Federal agencies conducting the same task—looking over each other's shoulder—adding expense, confusion, delay and frustration for our Nation's citizens.

There have been many changes recommended to improve the administration of this important program. This change is the easiest one. In that sense, I thought the provision should be noncontroversial. In fact, no Senator offered an amendment on the floor to address this provision. It was not challenged in the House. Hearings have been held in both the House and the Senate. The House-passed reauthorization of the Clean Water Act removes this duplicative authority. The bipartisan bill introduced in the Senate to reform the wetlands regulatory program removes this authority.

Knowing of the Clinton's administration's efforts to streamline Government, I was surprised to learn in the President's veto message that this provision is one of the reasons for the

President vetoing the bill that funds Federal employees at EPA, the Veteran's Administration, Housing and Urban Development, and others. Not even rank and file people at the EPA could think this is a very good reason for the President to prevent their funding bill from becoming law. This is truly an astonishing notion put forth by the President. He is saying, in effect, I don't trust the people who I hired and the people who work for me at the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to protect wetlands and to obey the law so I want to make sure I have another agency of people who I hired and who work for me to keep an eye on them.

Mr. President, for me, this issue is a flashback to another streamlining provision I proposed in the 102d and 103rd Congress. Several years ago, a farmer in St. Louis County came to my office with a real problem. He had some wet places of ground on his land and he had four different agencies coming out to that land telling him different things. I sent representatives out. The four agencies could not agree. They had swampbuster, they had section 404 regulations in hand. We got two different opinions on the particular wetlands problems and the agencies could not agree.

I had a modest suggestion and introduced legislation to make the Soil Conservation Service the lead agency responsible for technical determinations about wetlands on agricultural lands. After several years passed, I offered this proposal as an amendment on May 4, 1993, to S. 171, the Department of the Environment bill to elevate the EPA to Cabinet level. The administration opposed that idea also—at least initially. The opposition dug out all the same bogeymen, ghosts, and goblins. I was actually told that this amendment would make things more complicated—not less—if SCS was the lead agency. I was told this was the wrong vehicle and that the amendment would make wetlands regulation more expensive. The bipartisan amendment failed 40–54. Eight months later, the administration adopted this idea administratively and said they were glad they thought of it. In the interagency press release, they noted:

> The agreement eliminates this duplication of effort and gives the farmer one wetland determination from the Federal Government. Farmers can now rely on a single wetland determination by the Soil Conservation Services.

Interior Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks George T. Frampton, Jr., said:

> This agreement represents a common sense approach to administering wetlands programs affecting our Nation's farmers. We are minimizing duplication of effort.

For this administration, it is a fine line between extremism and common sense. I would hope that another change of heart could be in order but I fear that the pressure from environmental lobbyists may be too great.

During Senate hearings, EPA argued repeatedly that they never use the authority so we shouldn't care about them having it. I will argue that if they never use it, then why have it? I would like to know why the administration desperately needs an authority that has only been used 11 times in the last 20 years as tens of thousands of permit decisions were made. Is the President trying to say, well, yes, we agree that the EPA has not officially objected to corps decisions 99.9978 percent of the time, but we can never be too careful. We have so much extra money and so many people looking for work at EPA, that we better have them ready for that eventuality that occurs .0022 percent of the time.

The other argument that is used is that we would have the corps permitting themselves for their own activities. As Senators know, the corps does not actually issue itself section 404 permits but does follow all of the steps involved in the permitting process. Every other existing internal and external decision safeguard is affected by my legislative provision. The corps must meet the public interest review which requires the careful weighing of all public interest factors. Mr. President, listen to the list of criteria to be considered under the public interest review:

> All factors which may be relevant to the proposal must be considered including the cumulative effects thereof: among those are conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, historic properties, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use shore erosion, etc.

Additional criteria the corps are bound to follow are found in the section 404(b)(1) guidelines developed by the EPA. EPA retains its 404(q) authority, known as elevation authority, which allows the EPA and the Department of Commerce and the Interior to request higher level review within the Department of the Army. Individual State permitting and water quality certification requirements provide an additional form of objective safeguard to the corps regulatory program. Section 401 of the Clean Water Act requires State certification or waiver of certification prior to issuance of a section 404 permit—effectively giving States veto authority.

In addition to these requirements, the corps' implementing regulations require that district engineers conduct additional evaluations on applications with potential for having an effect on a variety of special interests such as Indian reservation lands, historic properties, endangered species, and wild and scenic rivers. The corps must satisfy the National Environmental Policy Act requirements during the permit process and permit decisions are subject to legal challenges. EPA also has lead enforcement authority. One final safeguard is provided by my fellow Senators. The great majority of corps projects are authorized by Congress. I believe this Congress has the understanding and concern to put the brakes on bad projects—environmental lobbyists and EPA wetlands experts are not the only people who understand and are willing to protect valuable wetlands.

As anyone can see, the cries from the environmental lobby are a red herring. There remains lots of bureaucracy and lots of redundancy for those who cherish it. In this case, they are crying wolf. My provision will do nothing to harm wetlands. Under my provision, if a wetland is or is not permitted, it will be because of an official decision made by an official of the Clinton administration.

What is this about? It is a plain old-fashioned bureaucratic turf fight. EPA bureaucrats have power and they don't want to surrender any of it. They have good working relationships with environmental lobbyists who don't want to see their access reduced. I have no doubt that EPA employees work very hard and have expertise in wetlands issues, but I am simply saying that the corps does, too, and one agency is enough. I expect bureaucrats to fight to protect power and to protect turf. What I do not expect, however, is their political leadership to provide them cover for doing so. Is the President here to create a government that works better and costs less or is he here to protect bureaucratic turf and the regulatory status quo. Unfortunately, the bureaucrats whose turf the President is protecting are currently at home because the President vetoed their funding bill—in part, and astonishingly, over this common-sense issue.

Mr. President, there was a New York Times article printed in the RECORD on December 14 [S18650] that discusses this issue. I ask unammious consent that my response to that letter be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Wall Street Journal op-ed piece entitled ''Death of a Family Farm,'' detailing an abuse of wetlands regulations.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 15, 1995.

MS. KRIS WELLS,
Editor, Letters to the Editor, The New York Times, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MS. WELLS: The December 12, 1995, story entitled ''Brief Clause in Bill Would Curb U.S. Power to Protect Wetlands'' is a very catchy headline, but grossly inaccurate. As the article accurately notes, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have dual decisional authority in permitting activities in wetlands. According to the Corps of Engineers, no other program maintains this dual decisional authority over the same permit or action.

In the spending measure I crafted for Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development and the EPA, I included a provision that eliminates this dual authority by removing EPA's authority to veto permits the Corps has issued. Therefore, the provision would indeed curb one and only one of the many ''EPA'' powers to protect wetlands, but it certainly does not curb ''U.S.'' power to protect wetlands unless you think the

''U.S.'' Army Corps of Engineers in not a federal agency. Additionally, these two agencies just happen to report to the same boss/es; ie., the President, Office of Management and Budget, the Counsel on Environmental Quality and the Vice President, who is a self-proclaimed advocate for the environment.

There are many things this government can no longer afford, and on the top of that list is bureaucratic redundancy. Leave it to the environmentalists to argue that we need two or more different federal agencies conducting the same task—looking over each other's shoulder—adding expense, confusion, delay and frustration. The bottom line on this issue and on the projects that were mentioned in the article is this: if a wetland is or is not permitted, it will be because of an official decision rendered by officials of the Clinton Administration. If people in the environmental community do not feel that the Clinton Administration has hired aggressive enough regulators, then they should take it up with the Clinton Administration and quit crying wolf about a common-sense provision to streamline government—a goal that the President has repeatedly endorsed.

As Vice-President Gore said on March 3, 1993: ''It's time we cut the red tape and trimmed the bureaucracy, and it's time we took out of our vocabulary the words, 'Well, we've always done it that way.' . . . Help us get rid of the waste and inefficiency. Help us get rid of the unnecessary bureaucracy. Let us know when you spot a problem and tell us when you've got an idea.'' Don't bother telling the environmental activists and lobbyists when you've got an idea. Which conservative ever called such dug-in-defenders of the status quo liberals?

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER S. BOND.

[From the Wall Street Journal]

DEATH OF A FAMILY FARM

(By Jonathan Tolman)

''My mother lives in Cranston. There aren't any wetlands there.'' This was the incredulous statement of a co-worker when I tried to explain to her the plight of the Stamp farm. Bill Stamp, president of the Rhode Island Farm Bureau, and his wife Carol own one of the few farms left in the state. But due to federal regulations, their farm is slated to close at the first of the year.

The Stamps' troubles all started when the city of Cranston, R.I., rezoned their property from agricultural to industrial. For years, Cranston had been trying to get the Stamps to develop their property. To give them an added incentive, the city decided to raise their taxes to the industrial bracket in1983.

In order to pay the higher taxes and keep their farming operation alive, the Stamps decided to develop part of the property at Cranston and move their farm to another part of the state. Their first encounter with wetlands happened three years later after they built a road on part of their property. The Stamps had already received permits from both the city and the state to proceed with the road when the Army Corps of Engineers decided to get involved.

Under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, before anyone can deposit dredged or fill material into a ''navigable water'' of the U.S., they must get a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. Over the years, with the legal prodding of environmentalists and a string of court cases, the Corps has expanded its definition of ''navigable water'' to include areas you wouldn't normally expect to see boats, namely wetlands.

Identifying wetlands is a difficult business. As the Corps pointed out in one of its recent press releases, ''Wetlands don't have to have visible water.'' Because of the tricky nature of wetland identification, in 1987 the Corps developed a 150-page manual filled with flow charts, appendices and guidelines for identifying wetlands.

Upon learning about the road, the Corps told the Stamps, ''Since a Federal permit has not been issued for the work you are presently performing, you are hereby ordered to cease and desist from any further work within Corps jurisdiction.'' In order to continue, the Stamps had to apply for a permit for the road they had already built. The Corps denied the permit, and demanded that the road be removed. In addition, the Corps demanded that the Stamps also remove the water and sewer lines which had been placed on their property. The Corps refused to consider any additional permits until the Stamps complied with their demands.

Realizing the mess they were in, the Stamps hired an expert consultant to help them with their wetland problems. After surveying the area with the Corps' own manual, the consultant came to the conclusion that the area where the Stamps built their road wasn't even a wetland. Just to be sure, he brought in two other wetland and soil scientists to look at the area. In a letter to Mr. Stamp, one of the experts, a dean at the University of Rhode Island, wrote: ''The delineation of wetlands on that portion of your property is obviously in error.'' The other consultant, a former New York State soil scientist, concluded, ''Since the soils would not qualify as hydric soils, the area would not be a wetland under the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers jurisdiction.''

Yet when the Corps was asked to reevaluate the site, it refused. The consultant, feeling that the Stamps had been wronged, wrote the Washington headquarters of the Corps and asked for a re-evaluation. The Acting Assistant Secretary of the Army. G. Edward Dickey, refused, ''because the Corps is a decentralized agency, the divisions and districts are responsible for most permit decisions and other related regulatory decisions, including delineations.'' (Perhaps someone should tell the secretary of the Army that he is now in charge of a ''decentralized agency.'')

Now, after the Stamps have spent thousands to restore the ''wetland,'' as well as having paid $15,000 in fines, thousands of dollars in legal fees and a lot more in increased property taxes, the original permits from the state of Rhode Island have expired. Unless the state can come through with new permits in the next few weeks, the Stamps will be unable either to sell or develop their land, and their financiers will likely foreclose on their farm in January.

Some might argue that in order to protect our nation's fragile wetlands, some errors and unfortunate incidents will happen, but in the long run it will be worth the price. The problem with this reasoning is that the 404 program doesn't really protect wetlands. Although the unwitting can get caught in the regulatory morass of the 404 program, savvy developers are aware of myriad exemptions, such as a rule that if the Corps does not respond within 30 days of being notified about a construction project of less than 10 acres, the developer can proceed with the project.

Because of such loopholes it is not surprising that many environmentalists detest the 404 program almost as much as landowners. An article published last spring in Audubon magazine described the 404 program as ''a hoax perpetrated and perpetuated by a wasteful, bloated bureaucracy that is efficient only at finding ways to shirk its obligations and that when beaten on by developers, spews wetland destruction permits as if it were a pinata.'' The environmentalists' argument isn't just liberal griping. Recent data from a nationwide survey of wetlands, conducted by the U.S. Agriculture Department, suggests that even though wetland regulation has increased in the last decade, wetland losses to development have not slowed. Even more ironic is that despite the continued loss of wetlands to development, a host of non-regulatory, incentive-based programs have restored so many wetlands that this year the U.S. will gain more wetlands than it lost.

Recently, Sen. John Chafee (R. R.I.), chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, announced plans to consider the re-authorization of the Clean Water Act, including the 404 program. The senator has the power to eliminate a program that both landowners and environmentalists agree is a bloated, wasteful bureaucracy. Maybe he can do it before another farm in his home state goes belly up.

Mr. BOND. Mr. President, there are many ways in which we can reform this program. We can do so in a bipartisan way. We can do so in a way that cuts redtape and offers new incentives for wetlands protection. We can do so in a way that includes more respect for those who currently protect wetlands—private property owners. We can bring rationality to the program and turn an important program into a more effective and maybe—maybe—even a more popular program. In the process, we might even give the States a greater role. In my State, I know we have officials who understand and care just as much about wetlands as the folks who work here in Washington. I am hopeful that these issues can be addressed. In the meantime, this legislative provision is an important start toward removing duplicative redtape and an important test for the President to see if he is so wed to the regulatory status quo, that he would reject this common-sense reform.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before discussing today's bad news about the Federal debt, how about ''another go'', as the British put it, with our pop quiz. Remember—one question, one answer.

The question: How many millions of dollars in a trillion? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the enormous Federal debt that is now about $12 billion shy of $5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business Wednesday, January 3, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at $4,988,377,902,358.91. Another depressing figure means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes $18,935.97.

Mr. President, back to our quiz—how many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion, which means that the Federal Government will shortly owe $5 million million.

Now who's not in favor of balancing the Federal budget?

THE NEW YEAR

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, the new year is now upon us, a Presidential

year, and already the competition is fierce among candidates for election to ''Safire's New Political Dictionary: The Definitive Guide to the New Language of Politics.'' Accordingly, Mr. President, I have the honor to propose as first-in-the-field, a remarkable triple-hyphenated safe bet and sure winner from the new year's day editorial of the Washington Post entitled, appropriately enough, ''The New Year.'' The editorial looked back to its predecessor 50 years ago, when the Post editorial writer of that age, contemplating the end of the Second World War, pondered whether the United Nations might now bring peace on Earth. This year's editorial comments, ''That sort of world-federal-ish talk seems almost quaint today.'' Indeed, it does. Cord Meyer apart, there are not likely to be as many as half a dozen Americans alive who remember the World Federalists and their unflinching attachment to world government. That, of course, is just the role editorials play in our lives; to remind us of forgotten fancies and dashed dreams, lest we become too much impressed with the wonders of our own age.

Mr. President, I can report that Mr. Safire, interviewed by telephone in his posh Washington offices, readily concurred that ''world-federal-ish'' was definitely an early starter for this year's pol-lexigraphic race, adding that it might prove a watershed compound and go on to win a triple crown.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I inquire, what is the current status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time of morning business for an additional 10 minutes, and that I be permitted to speak during that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could I suggest to my colleague that we extend it until 2 o'clock with Members allowed to speak therein for 10 minutes?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is the leader's intention to go into recess subject to the call of the Chair immediately after my statement.

Mr. SARBANES. There is a Member on our side who actually has left his office and is on his way to the floor, and we would like for him to have 10 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I think we have an agreement here that we would extend the period of time for morning business by 20 minutes, with 10 minutes allocated to this Senator and 10 minutes allocated to the Senator from Arkansas, as given by the Senator from Maryland. If that is acceptable, I so ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. And thereafter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate go into recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have come for the first time to a disturbing conviction. That conviction is that I do not believe this budget process is going to succeed. I am beginning to believe that any amount of negotiating in the future is not going to result in agreement. I have come to this point because 44 days after the President said he agreed that we should enact a balanced budget, nothing has happened, and I am not sure that negotiating and bargaining is being done in any way that would fulfill that commitment.

The President, first of all, has not demonstrated any history of supporting or proposing a balanced budget and has yet to put a balanced budget as scored by the agency that he insisted it be scored by, on the table.

He has vetoed the only real budget that has come before his desk, and even now, today, January 4, as I said, 44 days after he agreed to enact a balanced budget, he has yet to propose a balanced budget. President Clinton has now proposed four budgets, none of which has produced a balance. The third so-called balanced budget he proposed was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as $200 billion per year over balance as far as the eye could see, and then his fourth budget only managed to reduce the deficits to $100 billion a year for every year ad infinitum.

Not one Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, has voted for the President's budget. In one vote, it was defeated 96 to nothing, in another 99 to nothing. So this is just not Republican rhetoric. This is a unanimous rejection of the President's attempts to balance the budget by all Republicans and all Democrats in the Senate.

So for anybody who is under the illusion that the President has proposed a balanced budget with honest numbers, no one in this body, Republican or Democrat, agrees to that.

It seems to me, third, that at every stage of the negotiations the President has purposely tried to distract the Nation's attention from a balanced budget.

First, he talked about the number of years it would take to balance the budget and finally agreed, under duress I think, that 7 years would be the right number. But he was quoted as saying, and I quote again, ''[As President] I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget.'' He said that on Larry King in June.

And then in July, he said, ''But I do not believe it is good policy, based on my understanding of this budget—which is pretty good, now—to do it in 7 years.'' That he said in a Rose Garden ceremony in July.

Then he said, well, I think we ought to ''balance the budget in 10 years. It took decades to run up the deficit, it's going to take a decade to wipe it out.'' That was during his Presidential address to the Nation.

Then he used the scoring issue, that is, determining whether or not the numbers were real, as a distraction. He challenged us—and I sat over at the House of Representatives during his State of the Union Address—when he said, ''Let's at least argue about the same set of numbers so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them.'' That was in his address before a joint session of Congress on administration goals in February 1993.

And so we accepted that challenge, and we said we will agree, Mr. President; let us use the agency that you want to use. That is the Congressional Budget Office. And then we argued back and forth, back and forth, and the President said, well, the Congressional Budget Office, I do not agree with them. I wish to use my own numbers.

For nearly 9 months he was able to distract the press, the Congress, and the American people from the real issue of balancing the budget by focusing the debate on how long it ought to take, on what numbers we ought to use. So he—I have to give him credit—he masterfully maneuvered and shifted the debate for month after month after month when the real issue was balancing the budget.

The President's attitude is particularly destructive because we are at a unique moment in recent history. We have the opportunity to pass a real balanced budget, interestingly enough, at a time when the differences between us are not that great. We have a chance to negotiate because really we are quite close. A number of Democrats have worked with Republicans in trying to put together an alternative budget

that would reach balance, and the number differences really are not that far apart.

The differences between the Republican budget and the President's only amounts to 2 percent of the entire budget. Even on the most divisive issues, those issues of Medicare, Medicaid, and welfare reform, we are quite close.

On the most contentious issue of all, Medicare, both the President and the First Lady have essentially stated that they would do more to slow the rate of growth than what the Republicans have done. In 1993 the President said:

> . . . Medicare and Medicaid are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. This is not a Medicare and Medicaid cut.

The First Lady in 1993 said:

> We are talking about beginning to reduce the rate of increase . . . in the Medicare from about 11 percent . . . increase annually to about 6 or 7 percent increase annually.

So what the Republicans have done in their budget is exactly what both the President and the First Lady had indicated that we ought to do. And yet now it is politically turned to the fact that the Republicans are trying to cut when it is not a cut. We are trying to do what they suggested.

My point is, not necessarily that the President is playing politics with this, although clearly he is, my point is that we are not far apart at all.

I think we need to understand also that this partial shutdown of Government could be solved overnight if the President had simply signed the appropriations bills that were sent to him. He chose to veto the Interior appropriations, the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations, and the VA–HUD appropriations bills. Those hundreds of thousands of workers, Federal workers that are not now working that we hear about every day at drumbeat out of the White House could all be at work if the President had just signed the bills that we sent to him.

What is discouraging, Mr. President, is that we have come so close for a result so important and that the remaining differences between us are narrow. But it seems to me that the President is willing to sacrifice perhaps one of the most important things the U.S. Congress could do in this decade if not this century. We are sacrificing that, the demands of history for the demands of politics.

Look, this game cannot continue indefinitely. We have to end this political posturing. I think we have a moral obligation to do so. I am convinced that we should set some kind of firm deadline and prove once and for all if the President has any intention of supporting a balanced budget. That deadline ought to be set in weeks, not months.

If the President refuses to negotiate in good faith to reach that agreement and do what he said he would do, that is, put a budget on the table that actually balanced, if he is not willing to do this, then I think we should end this politically motivated pretense that is going on.

It would then become an issue to be decided in the 1996 elections. Voters would be presented with a very clear choice: The status quo, continue the Government growing as it has, leave it the same, that Government needs to do more, keep spending, keep taxing, or change the fundamental direction and course of Government and achieve a balanced budget.

If we do that, we can pass appropriations bills that produce enough savings to ensure that we can still reach a balanced budget in 7 years during this interim period between the time we cut off negotiations and the election of 1996.

Mr. President, I suggest that it is time for the games and the politics and the distractions to end. There is one issue, and one issue only that we must decide: Will we fulfill the promise of this unique moment in passing a balanced Federal budget? All the rest can be negotiated if both sides negotiate in good faith. If the President refuses to do so, as he has done to this moment, then the question will need to be put to the American people—is it enough for a President to talk about a balanced budget or do we need a President who will actually agree to a balanced budget?

Mr. President, I yield back any time I have remaining.

Mr. BUMPERS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

HOW LONG UNTIL SOME MEMBERS IN CONGRESS COME TO THEIR SENSES?

Mr. BUMPERS. Mr. President, when I was a young man the Governor of Tennessee, the then-Governor of Tennessee, Frank Clement, delivered the keynote address at the Democratic national convention. As I matured and studied speeches like that, I decided it was not quite as great as I thought it was at the time. But the thrust of the speech was, ''How long, America?'' And he kept coming back to that recurring theme. ''How long, oh, how long, America?'' In other words, how long are we going to wait for solutions to these problems?

That would be a good speech to give today, how long the American people are going to have to wait until some people in this body, but especially in the House, come to their senses.

This morning we had a group of Social Security workers come into our Little Rock office. I was out at the time. My legislative director suggested that they call the Speaker of the House. He told them he would be happy to give them the names of the 73 freshmen Congressman over there, their telephone numbers, and reminded them that the Senate had voted to do precisely what should be done, thanks to the courage of the majority leader.

The majority leader probably is not interested in having a Democrat compliment him for what he did because I am sure he is taking unbelievable flak from some quarters in his own party. That goes with the leadership. If you are not willing to stand up for what you believe, you do not deserve to be called a leader. If you do not stand up for responsible Government, you do not deserve to be here.

We have a saying in Arkansas when something is really out of the ordinary. We say, ''I have been to two State fairs and a goat rope, and I never seen anything like this before.'' I can tell you, I have never seen anything like this before. I pray to God we never see anything like it again, because if the checks and balances of the Constitution can be circumscribed and circumvented by a simple hard-core majority who are willing to stick together, and most of whom distrust Government, strongly distrust Government, the next question you have to ask yourself is, if people are willing to abuse their power by circumventing the Constitution in a way that was never intended by Madison and the other Framers, how long can we continue to govern ourselves? That is a very legitimate question that you are going to hear asked more and more if this is not resolved shortly.

The American people are divided to some extent. They do not understand it. But I can tell you, each day that goes on they become increasingly apprehensive about just what is going on, what is the meaning of it. They are not Federal employees, and so they are not very perturbed about it. But as they see their lives disrupted, as everybody's lives are going to be, if this goes on much longer, they are going to acclimate themselves and attune themselves to what is going on here.

We should not for one moment forget what is the overriding issue here. There is a minor constitutional crisis that could loom very large in the future; there is, obviously, a tremendous political battle going on, and that is where the American people really do not understand why we would subject this country to this for political reasons.

But we should not ever forget one simple fact: All we have to do is what the Senate did the night before last and pass a continuing resolution and get Government up and running. It has nothing to do—it has nothing to do—with the discussions going on at the White House. You can resolve every single issue that is at stake here without sending 250,000 workers home and others with half paychecks and scaring the pants off a lot of American citizens.

The tax cut is one of the issues. That is not an unsurmountable problem. I cannot tell you how I detest the thought of that $245 billion tax cut, and every time I look at the statistics on who gets that $245 billion, I am literally stunned that every newspaper in

the country is not editorializing on it every single day.

Think about it. The people who make less than $30,000 a year get virtually not one dime of it, and if you make $300,000 a year, you are going to get over $8,000 a year in tax cuts. What kind of a nation passes tax bills like that?

Let me go back. That is based on a CBO assumption that the budget will be balanced in the year 2002, and by doing so, interest rates will decline to the point that over a 7-year period, we will save $245 billion. I can tell you that is a massive assumption, one that I can almost guarantee you will never come about.

In order for that to come true, every single projection of growth rate, interest rates, and unemployment which the Congressional Budget Office puts out would have to come true, literally true—every one of those things.

It also means that next year and the next year and the next year, through 7 years, Congress will do precisely what was projected in this 1995 budget resolution. We will not even do what the budget resolution does in 1996. I can bet you we will not do it. We certainly are not going to do it every year between now and the year 2002. You are going to have tornadoes in my State, you are going to have floods in the Midwest, you are going to have hurricanes in Florida, you are going to have droughts throughout the Midwest, and we are going to pick up the tab for every bit of it. None of that is anticipated in the budget resolution.

But for purposes of argument, because the President did, in fact, come out with his own tax cut, not nearly as massive as this one, but why not say to the Republicans: ''You're hot for a $245 billion tax cut. You want to spend all of $245 billion the Congressional Budget Office says you are going to save over the next 7 years. We do not believe that. Not only do we disagree strongly on who would get the tax benefits, we do not think those savings will ever materialize. But to prove our good faith, why don't we do this? Let's wait until the budget for 1998 comes up before we get into this tax-cutting business. If all CBO's projections have come true, interest rates are as low as they projected, all the other economic indices are the way they projected them and the savings are materializing, then say, 'OK, we'll accept a $200 tax refund for all the children in America,' and if it goes according to Hoyle for 2 more years, up it to $400.''

Why would that not be a simple solution to it? After all, once you put that tax cut in place, if this place falls apart and the dome of the Capitol falls to the ground, you will not be able to take that tax cut away. You are going to be spending the money for a tax cut that you do not have, because we will never undo it. So why do it, unless you know the savings are going to be there?

I heard the majority whip say this morning that this President is the first President that ever wanted more money. He never heard of anybody vetoing a bill because they wanted more money. I remind the Senator from Mississippi, Ronald Reagan used to go around saying, ''I'm being accused for these massive deficits, and you know I can't spend a penny that Congress doesn't appropriate.''

To the ordinary layman out there, that is fine, because the people always liked the President better than Congress.

I ask unanimous consent for 5 additional minutes, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, we were to go into recess. The Senator is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. BUMPERS. While he was saying, ''I can't spend a penny that Congress doesn't appropriate,'' he was never vetoing any money bills. He signed everything we sent him, and the people should be grateful, because while he was President, Congress appropriated billions less than he asked for. But he vetoed a defense bill because it was not high enough, and we had to give him more money to get him to sign the bill.

Mr. President, the American people last fall were angry about a host of things. There was no one single thing that people were angry about. There were a whole host of things they were angry about. It is an interesting thing, you take 1 percent of the vote last fall and shift 1 percent of the vote here, here and there, and we would not have anything bordering on an American revolution.

As far as the bonded Contract With America, so far two things have passed both Houses and have been signed by the President, and both of them would probably have been passed without the so-called Contract With America.

People were not voting for the Contract With America, because they did not know anything about it. They were voting because they were angry. They were angry about the deficit, they were angry about gays in the military, they were angry about some Members getting in trouble. It was a whole host of things.

But I can tell you, Mr. President, the one thing they were not voting for was chaos. So far, that is all they have gotten out of it.

The other day I mentioned James Baldwin, a great black author, who wrote a book called ''Go Tell It on the Mountain.'' In the book—it was sort of autobiographical, I guess—the person who was the central character in the book was obviously James Baldwin.

He described the churches when he was a youngster and how people would have dinner on the grounds after church. Senator HEFLIN, and southerners like Senator HEFLIN and I know what that is like. He has been to a thousand dinners on the grounds after church on Sundays, just as I have.

James Baldwin describes in the book listening to some of the black preachers talk about how many souls they had saved in the last revival, how many souls they had saved in the last year, and this youngster who wanted to be a preacher was offended by the way they talked about how many souls they had saved, not as individual people who were actually saved but macro numbers, and he took a vow that never would he take the gift of God so lightly.

As you might guess, as you go on into the book, he becomes a minister, and the first thing you know, he is one of the big stars at the dinner on the grounds after the church services, and he is talking about how many souls you save, as he said originally, as though you were talking about ears of corn being lopped off the stalk. Yes, he fell into it, too. It was a magnificent novel. I recommend it to you. Here we talk about 250,000 employees, which is a big number. Do you know what they are? They are red-blooded human beings with families, with obligations. Some of them are losing their credit rating right now because they cannot pay their bills. They, each one, count.

When people sometimes ask me how I would sum up our democracy and the Constitution of the United States—which is sacred to me—I always say the Constitution of the United States says one thing. Well, it does not say it, but it means one thing and, that is, each one of us counts. Our criminal justice system, our whole legal system, all of our freedoms in the Constitution say each one of us counts, and each one of these 250,000 people who are suffering count. I know how nice it is to go into a coffee shop. ''It has not hurt me any.'' ''I have not lost a thing.'' ''It looks to me like we can probably do without those 250,000 from now on.'' You let this go on another 2 weeks and see what they are saying in the coffee shops.

So, Mr. President, these are human beings, and they are depending on Congress to do the right thing, to govern and not abuse their power. What is the cost of this? Why are the American people not up in arms about this? They say $45 million a day. I do not know who computed that, but add $12 million to that as of Sunday night. The 10-percent airline costs—do you want to take a guess what revenues that produces to the U.S. Government every year? Between $4 and $5 billion. We are losing $12 million a day. Add that to the $45 million, and then you take the loss of revenues of the communities who are dependent on Government, national parks, and so on. You are going to be at $100 million a day, while we continue to negotiate and bargain and bicker about sums much, much smaller than that. It is the height of irresponsibility to hold this country hostage in order to get your way. It is an outrageous abuse of power. I do not mind saying, in a partisan way, that I believe a lot of people are going to pay for this come next November.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMENICI. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOMENICI. What is the situation in the Senate now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair indicates to the Senator that we are acting on a unanimous-consent request that the Senate go into recess subject to the call of the Chair immediately after the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas, and those have just finished.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity this morning to speak because I had to be elsewhere, which you might suspect.

I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call for 5 minutes after which I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and then the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator can ask for a quorum call but cannot predetermine what takes place after that. The Senator can ask unanimous consent to speak or put in a quorum call and then state that request, and the Chair would consider that.

Mr. DOMENICI. The quorum call needs to run before I make the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. SARBANES. If the Senator will withhold for a moment, is the Senator prepared to proceed now?

Mr. DOMENICI. I need that 5 minutes that I was seeking.

Mr. SARBANES. Senator NUNN would also seek 10 minutes. Why do we not take a quorum call and then see if we can work that out.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. Reserving the right to object. Could we have 3 minutes on this side, as well? We have been doing an equilibrium thing here all day.

I amend the request to ask unanimous consent that this side of the aisle have 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

THE NEED FOR A LIMITED CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been in the chair listening for some time, and I wanted to make a couple of observations. First of all, I agree thoroughly with Senator DOLE and the Members of this body in seeking to have a resolution which would put the Government back in place. It seems to me that that is what we should do. We ought to have a limited CR in which there is time to proceed with what I hope are useful negotiations that are going on. We need to put this thing behind us and get on with resolving the problems.

There are, however, I think, a couple of other things that we also ought to be able to expect. One is that the White House and the President should deliver what they said they would. We did this on November 19, I believe. We had an agreement that we would have a CR, that during that time there would be a balanced budget based on CBO numbers, over 7 years. It did not happen. That did not happen. Then we had an opportunity—the White House did—to pass appropriations bills, to put almost all those back to work who are now furloughed. They did not do that. He vetoed it.

Mr. President, there is another difficulty that we have had in Wyoming. It has to do with Yellowstone Park. There was an article in the paper this morning about it. Our Governor sought to negotiate with the Secretary of the Interior so that the State would take responsibility for part of Yellowstone Park. There was no real effort on the part of the Secretary to do that. Promise to return calls, promise to do something to consider a proposition by the State, did not do that. So not only are the employees of the National Park Service in this case not working, but neither are the concessionaires, neither are those who had contracted to do work, because the Department of Interior did not, frankly, make the real effort to do anything about that. So there has to be some responsibility assigned there in terms of doing what we said we would do.

Second, Mr. President, it seems to me that those who are doing the negotiating, if they really wanted to find a solution, if there was a real, honest-to-goodness effort on the part of the parties to find a solution, they could do that. It is time to do that.

Frankly, I suggest that the three principles sit down, the President, the majority leader, and the Speaker of the House—eliminate all the observers, eliminate the staff—and come to some agreement, come to the snubbing post on what we ought to do. There is a lot of leeway within this outline, and we can do that. Mr. President, that is our job.

Our job is to find solutions. That is what we are here for. That is why we are the trustees for the American people. Our job is to keep the Government functioning in as effective way as we know how. Our job is to make decisions and to move forward. We have great opportunities to do that, great opportunities in this place to do that. There are opportunities in the White House.

There is not much point in assigning blame, but there is plenty to go around. We ought to come to the snubbing post and make some decisions. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the previous order, I be recognized to speak for not more than 10 minutes, Senator NUNN be recognized thereafter for up to 15 minutes, and following those remarks, I ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CURRENT SITUATION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, there has been a rather lengthy discussion this morning about the continuing resolution and the status of our public employees. I very much wanted to be here this morning to talk about it, but obviously I had some other things I had to do as we seek to get a balanced budget.

I thought I might take just a few minutes and talk about the fact that the situation that we are in today is the result of both the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States having certain rights and certain responsibilities. In a sense, it is a two-way street, not a one-way street like everybody has been talking about, including the President, who used the words ''cynical strategy'' to talk about the Republican Congress, albeit he chose to say it was the Republican House rather than both of us. ''Cynical strategy'' seemed to indicate that the entire blame for where we are today should be borne by the U.S. House Republicans, or a combination of the House Republicans and the Senate Republicans.

Mr. President, and fellow Americans, that is not true. Let me state what Republicans have done and what I perceive that the President has not done that put us in this situation that we are in today. Before I begin that, I would like very much to state once again that I hope we can resolve the issue of Federal employees who have not been paid and who have been relying upon their paychecks while they work without pay or relying upon them because we promise to pay them. I think we ought to solve that issue and solve it quickly. They are not responsible for the problem.

Having said that, Republicans in both Houses produced a balanced budget using real numbers and using the Congressional Budget Office estimates. We already did that. The President of the United States, in his capacity as the Chief Executive, chose to veto that.

Had that been signed, obviously we would not be in this mess.

I am not standing here saying the President has no prerogative to veto that. He vetoed it. Nonetheless, we had already passed many of the appropriations bills, and the President got on television yesterday and enumerated a whole series of things that were situations where either people are suffering because we have not passed certain appropriations bills, or the Government cannot do certain things like issue visas, so many foreigners cannot get in the country. And the President is critical of the Congress—in particular, the Republicans in the House—because he says they are to blame for this.

Let me remind the American people this is a two-way street. Had the President of the United States signed three bills which he vetoed—Commerce, State, Justice; Interior appropriations; VA–HUD appropriations—many of the long list and litany of things that have gone wrong in America would not have gone wrong. They would have been taken care of by these bills.

Now, there are some who took to the floor this morning and said the President has this absolute right to veto but Congress has no rights; they must respond and either give him what he wants or suffer the consequences of partial closure of Government. Not so. No student of our Constitution is going to tell you that. When he vetoes them, he bears some responsibility for vetoing them. We certainly have a responsibility to say, well, if he vetoed them, try something else and see if we can get through this.

I understand that is being tried and some targeted appropriations are being worked on. I hope it works. I hope the President understands the next time we send him something that is targeted that he does not have the absolute right to veto them and then claim it is our responsibility because the Government is closed. We have a right to stand up and say, ''Mr. President, these are tough times. We do not agree on a lot of things, but you do not have the absolute immunity to veto bills and blame us because the Government is closed.''

You might have to look at the next Interior bill. Mr. President, there was not very much money involved in that Interior bill. Frankly, you got some bad advice on the Interior bill, yet you get up and talk about cynicism when most of those U.S. monuments, the museums, would have all been opened if you had signed that bill. You look at your list, Mr. President, of why you vetoed it—pretty flimsy stuff. If you have some responsibility in this, then the public ought to look at why you vetoed them and what were your reasons.

Let me also suggest that the President used some very, very strained—strained—words when he spoke of cynical strategy. I am working in good faith with this President to try to get a balanced budget, but I believe he and his entire administration have been engaged in a cynical strategy since June of this year when they produced a budget allegedly in balance that did not use the Congressional Budget Office numbers and economics but used their own, concocted by their on economists, by their own OMB personnel, and have never to this day produced a balanced budget using the Congressional Budget Office numbers. That is a strategy. It is a beautiful strategy. Since the word ''cynical'' is battered around, it is a cynical strategy because never to this day—while blaming Republicans for all kinds of things—never to this day has the President of the United States had to put a balanced budget on the table. We are negotiating with him and he still has never put one on. He has not put it on in the negotiations. And I am breaching nothing there, everybody understands he has not. He did not when we asked him to, and he signed a continuing resolution that said we would be bound by the Congressional Budget Office economics and numbers, and the conclusion on that is that means the final agreement will be judged that way, not that I have to produce one. Is that not interesting?

So, to this date, no balanced budget in 7 years using the CBO numbers has been produced by this White House, by this President, by his Cabinet. And they are now engaged in blaming this whole episode on Republicans.

At least it is a two-way street from here to Pennsylvania Avenue, and when Presidents veto bills that fund Government, they take a bit of the responsibility of what will happen if Congress chooses not to fund some of those. After all, I do not advocate this, but the truth of the matter is the Constitution is eminently clear. Congress has the purse strings of the U.S. Government. We decide how to spend the taxpayers' money, and that is not a shared responsibility, I regret to say. That is a singular responsibility, and we have been choosing not to fund what the President wants.

We are also trying to get a balanced budget, which the President either does not want or wants something different on. These are difficult political and philosophical times. What is at stake is big. For some of us what is at stake is whether future generations have to pay for our bills or whether we will pay for them ourselves.

So, whenever we have stories about things going wrong because Government is closed, none of us like that. But the big reason for all this, it all starts because Republicans have come to the conclusion that we want to live up to our commitment to use real numbers, no phony numbers, use Congressional Budget Office numbers and produce significant change in Government so as to produce a balanced budget.

So I wish I could have done this earlier in the day, but I think I have made my case. I think I have made my case that the reason we are in this mess is not just because Republicans have not sent bills to the President to fund Government; the President bears some of the blame, and I have elaborated that as best I could here today. It is a two-way street, and bantering around words like cynicism, and a cynical strategy, deserves a response. Or it is not too far-fetched to conclude that their strategy in the White House has been a cynical strategy of rather significant proportions.

I yield the floor.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. SARBANES. Will the Senator from Georgia yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. NUNN. I yield the 30 seconds.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I think it is important at this point to have printed in the RECORD a quote from Investor's Business Daily, November 8 of 1995.

> Gingrich has said he would force the government to miss interest and principal payments for the first time ever to force Democratic Clinton's administration to agree to his seven-year deficit reductions.

And a quote from Representative SHERWOOD BOEHLERT, a quote from the Los Angeles Times of November 14:

> You have a group in our conference who could not care less if the government shuts down. . . . They will be cheering.

I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

BUDGET IMPASSE AND CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have made it clear in previous remarks and other public statements that I oppose shutting down portions of the Federal Government as a tactic in the budget debate. I have supported the continuing resolutions that would restore funding for full Government operations as we continue to move toward the objective of a balanced budget.

I applaud the leadership of Senator DOLE, Senator DASCHLE, and others in this body who have concluded that the current situation is artificially created, it is unnecessary and is a wasteful burden on Federal workers and on the taxpayers they serve.

Mr. President, I recall here over the last 20 years, several debates on holidays, whether we ought to add another holiday to the overall holidays the Federal Government observes. I remember people totaling up the amount of money it costs to have one holiday and projecting that over 20 years and talking about the astounding cost when you pay people for a holiday. If anyone stops and thinks about what we are doing now, I believe we are about on day No. 20—there may be a few more days in that counting the previous shutdown—we really have had 20 to 25 additional holidays this year where the taxpayers of this country are paying for people who want to work but who are not allowed to work, but they are

going to be paid. And that is, to me, a real paradox, as to how you possibly can start off a quest to save $1.2 trillion over 7 years by declaring over 20 paid holidays for workers.

And then, it is not only the workers themselves—it is unfair to them because they want to work, they are not getting paid now, and that is a hardship—but also it is terribly unfair to literally hundreds of thousands and growing to be millions of Americans who are suffering because of this shutdown.

Mr. President, there are many examples of the harm being done by the shutdown. One example which has not drawn much attention is the fact that the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the CDC in Atlanta, GA, is virtually shut down. Today is the 50th year of operation of the Communicable Disease Center, and it is effectively closed. Except for a skeleton staff, no personnel are available to fulfill the functions of the CDC.

This is bound to have an impact on the health and safety of the American people and, indeed, citizens around the world. The workers at the CDC are the same Federal workers who pinpointed the cause of Legionnaire's disease and toxic shock syndrome. These are the same men and women who risked their lives to investigate the recent outbreak of ebola and track the course of influenza, AIDS, and TB across the Nation and indeed the world. Their job is to investigate, to define, to monitor and to prevent disease—to get out in front of emerging infectious diseases, food and waterborne diseases, respiratory inspections, birth defects, lead poisoning, air pollution, radiation, and other environmental health emergencies.

The problem in this area is you do not know it is an emergency if you are not out in front of it before it is too late. We will be lucky if we get by with this shutdown and closedown of the CDC without having some serious problem and erosion in the health of the American people.

In some cases, the CDC implements control measures during a critical time when minutes and even seconds count. Rarely a week passes by without the CDC directing the Nation's attention to important new research findings on public health issues. At this point, we do not know what public health crisis will emerge in 1996. With a CDC shutdown, we do not know what might be happening right now. What we do know is that the CDC plays a critical role in watching for signs and sustaining sophisticated surveillance and monitoring communications with medical health officers in our Nation and throughout the world. We do not know the impact of the Government shutdown on the health of the U.S. citizens. We may not know it until it is too late.

Like other Federal employees, the people in CDC are deeply dedicated, hard-working persons, scientists, physicians, and public health professionals. Some even risk their lives to investigate outbreaks of unknown, sometimes even deadly diseases. These people are protecting the Nation's health and they are anxious to return to their jobs.

In addition, the CDC personnel who are not at work, who would otherwise be there, they would be providing critical funding for technical assistance to State and local programs for sexually transmitted diseases, TB, HIV, childhood immunization, environmental health, national and international chronic and infectious disease prevention, breast and cervical cancer. We all need to recognize they are not on the job.

Mr. President, diseases, viruses, bacterial infections, and cancers do not stop because of a Government furlough or a partisan political and budget debate.

CDC grants to State health agencies to fund prevention programs that are fundamental to saving lives and maintaining the health of our population are also being affected adversely. Programs in 20 States for rape prevention are in danger, and funds for staffing hotlines for public health emergencies, such as violence, STDs, and HIV, may halt operations. All of this is in great risk.

We cannot afford to wait to open the doors at the CDC. The health of the Nation and the world could be at stake.

I urge our colleagues in the House to think again about the tactics they are using. They are trying to get the budget balanced, and that is a goal that all of us should work toward. And I hope we can achieve that. But the tactics being used are totally counterproductive to the taxpayers and to the country and to the health of our citizens. We must not continue to hold hostage the health and safety of American citizens who are paying for a service that is not being rendered.

THE BUDGET DILEMMA—A TWO-WAY STREET

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, my friend from New Mexico talked about the rights of the Congress regarding the purse strings, and the rights of the President regarding the veto. And he emphasized that this is a two-way street. I agree that the budget dilemma, the budget challenge, the effort to balance the 7-year budget, is indeed a two-way street. The American people should hold all of us accountable for that.

But this continuing tactic to keep the Government closed down is not a two-way street. There are a group of people who believe—I think erroneously so—that it gives them leverage. In effect they are saying that the President should care more about the health of the American people, about the workers out there, than the Congress does. Otherwise, why is it leverage? Is it leverage for you to hold somebody hostage if both have an equal stake in returning that innocent victim without being harmed? If it is not leverage, then why do it? If it is leverage, that means that the Congress does not have an interest in the workers and does not have an interest in the people who are being affected in this country, and indeed abroad.

Mr. President, I do not understand any logic behind the House Republicans' position. And I again am gratified that the leadership of the Senate on both sides of the aisle recognize that this is counterproductive, and recognize that the wrong people are being held hostage in this high-level game of Russian roulette.

Mr. President, one closing thought again in response to the thoughts voiced by my good friend from New Mexico, Senator DOMENICI.

This effort to get the budget under control is indeed a two-way street. As I think we have set forth in the Chafee group composed of about 10 Democrats and about 10 Republicans, there is no reason the parties cannot come together. It is not easy. It is not something that can be done in an or hour or two hours but over a 2-, 3-, 4- or 5-day period should be able to be done.

I do not think there is any question about the responsibility of keeping the Government closed. That is a tactical decision made by House Republicans. But all of us are involved in the effort to try to get the budget under control. It is very clear what has to be done. The administration and Democrats have to be willing to save more on entitlements, to restrain the growth of entitlements more than has thus far been indicated. Republicans have to be willing to come down some on what they are doing in terms of the cuts in Medicare and Medicaid which are too severe. That is very apparent.

It is also apparent that both the Republicans and the White House need to take another thorough look at tax cuts. It is to me almost unbelievable that we can be starting a quest to get the budget under control by declaring a very large dividend at the very beginning before we have implemented anything. That is what large tax cuts do. So I am hoping that the tax cuts will come down, and that the Republicans will agree to that.

I am hoping that those of us on the Democratic side will recognize that we have to restrain the entitlement growth. That is the heart of what has to be done. It is apparent for all of us to see. There are a lot of complexities in doing it. But we will have to make those movements.

In the final analysis, there is a right of the President to veto, and there is a right of Congress not to appropriate. There also is a right of the American people to say, ''We have had enough; a plague on both your houses. We send people to Washington to be able to reach reasonable compromises to govern this Nation effectively and both political parties are failing at that task.''

At some point the American people are going to come to that conclusion,

and they are going to come to the conclusion that both parties are to blame. I hope everyone recognizes that because that day, if it has not already arrived, is fast approaching.

I believe it is up to all of us to put aside some of the harsh and unreasonable rhetoric and some of the incivility that has gone into this debate and to recognize we all have an obligation to the American people and to our children and grandchildren to get this Nation's fiscal house in order and to do it in a responsible way, a way that will not be looked back on in a year or two as an absolute march of folly but a way that is fair and effective for the American people.

TRIBUTE TO ADM. ARLEIGH A. BURKE

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, today a grateful Nation pays its final tribute to a true patriot and hero, Adm. Arleigh A. Burke, who died on Monday at the age of 94.

Admiral Burke will be buried on the grounds of the Naval Academy in Annapolis, where he graduated in 1923. His service to the Nation will serve as a model to Academy graduates as well as all members of the Armed Forces for generations to come.

Admiral Burke said he was attracted to the Navy because, in his words, the rules were ''strict, known and observed.'' His adherence to the rules was a matter of personal honor, not bureaucratic timidity. When it came to strategy and tactics, he was a bold innovator. During World War II, he initiated dramatic changes in naval doctrine, developing and implementing tactics relying on the speed and maneuverability to destroyers armed with torpedoes to undertake offensive operations.

Admiral Burke's Destroyer Squadron 23, known as the ''Little Beavers'' compiled an outstanding combat record in the Pacific in 1943, which earned him the Distinguished Service Medal, the Navy Cross, and the Legion of Merit. During the assaults on Bougainville and Buka in the Solomon Islands, he made two dramatic high speed runs, crippling Japanese airfields and sinking a large number of Japanese vessels. Reflecting the speed and daring of these maneuvers, Adm. William F. Halsey gave him the nickname ''Thirty-One Knot Burke'' after Burke sent a message to American transports announcing: ''Stand aside! Stand aside! I'm coming through at 31 knots.'' A Presidential Unit Citation praised the squadron's ''daring defiance of repeated attacks by hostile groups'' and its attacks on the ''enemy's strongly fortified shores to carry out sustained bombardments against Japanese coastal defenses and render effective cover and fire support for * * * major invasion operations * * *.''

Subsequently he helped plan the invasions of Iwo Jima, Guam, the Marianas, and Okinawa. At Okinawa, the ship on which he was serving was hit by kamikaze suicide planes, and he was awarded the Silver Star for rescuing sailors trapped in a compartment by smoke and fire resulting from the attack.

After the war, he served in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations, where he produced an influential report emphasizing the vital role of the Navy in the post-war national security establishment. Although the inter-service rivalries of the period nearly cost him promotion to the grade of admiral, President Truman recognized his skills and character and he was promoted.

During the Korean war, Admiral Burke served as commander of a cruiser division and as a member of the Military Armistice Commission. In 1955, he was appointed by President Eisenhower and confirmed by the Senate as Chief of Naval Operations, a position he filled for an unprecedented three terms. He played a key role in the development of antisubmarine technology, the Polaris submarine, and strengthening allied navies.

President Kennedy offered him the opportunity to serve a fourth term as CNO, but Admiral Burke declined so that the Navy could have younger leadership. After retiring from the Navy, he helped to establish and lead the Center for Strategic and International Studies, which has provided numerous influential studies on national security matters. He also served as president of the Capital Area Council of the Boy Scouts of America. In January 1977, Admiral Burke was awarded the Nation's highest civilian award, the Medal of Freedom, by President Ford. The Navy's *Arleigh Burke* class is named in his honor. When the lead ship, the *Arleigh Burke,* was commissioned in 1991, he gave the crew a simple, direct message reflecting his belief in providing the Navy with the best equipment and hard training: ''This ship is built to fight,'' he said. ''You'd better know how.'' It is most fitting that the crew of the lead ship, the *Arleigh Burke,* will be present to honor him today.

The current Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Mike Boorda, summed up Admiral Burke's career when he said: ''Admiral Arleigh Burke defined what it means to be a naval officer: relentless in combat, resourceful in command and revered by his crews. He was a sailor's sailor.''

I wish to express my condolences to his wife of 72 years, Roberta ''Bobbie'' Gorsuch Burke, and to express my appreciation for his devoted service to our Nation.

I think we can indeed say—all of us can say—that he followed military affairs, and that Admiral Burke, in Admiral Boorda's words indeed ''* * * defined what it means to be a naval officer: relentless in combat, resourceful in command and revered by his crews.'' He was, indeed, ''a sailor's sailor.''

Mr. President, I thank my colleagues for the time, and I will yield back any I have.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. LEAHY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, there is a unanimous-consent agreement, as I understand it, to recess subject to the call of the Chair. I wonder if I could ask unanimous consent that I might be heard for not more than 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for up to 3 minutes.

Mr. LEAHY. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

He, like I, was among the skeleton crew here during the Christmas and New Year's time as we were trying to move things along, and I know he has had more than enough time to sit in that chair and I hate to add to it.

REFUSING MY PAY DURING THE GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, tomorrow, like other Members of Congress, I will receive a paycheck for the last 2 weeks. In good conscience, however, I cannot use this money while thousands of Federal Government employees are denied their paychecks because Congress refuses to reopen the Government. Until this Government shutdown ends, I will be putting the amount of my paycheck into escrow.

As a matter of principle, Members of Congress should be treated the same as all Federal employees. I work for the people of Vermont, including the hard-working Federal workers who are being punished by this Government shutdown. If the Federal workers in my home State cannot receive a paycheck, then I will not receive a paycheck.

I am a cosponsor and strong supporter of Senator BOXER's no budget-no pay bill which would stop the pay of Members of Congress during a Government shutdown. The Senate has passed this legislation three separate times, but the leadership of the House of Representatives refuses to bring the bill to a vote. I would also note that the Senate has passed legislation to put people back to work. The distinguished majority leader, Senator DOLE, introduced a continuing resolution which passed to that effect. But that has been rejected by the House of Representatives.

I urge the House Speaker and my other colleagues in the House and Senate to also give up their paychecks until Congress ends this foolish Government shutdown. Speaker GINGRICH and the House Republicans are all accepting their pay while Federal workers are working without pay or forced to stay home without pay. In fact, at least one Member of the other body said he would accept his pay ''because he is in the Constitution,'' although I do not find his name in my copy of the Constitution. I believe it is the height of arrogance for them to accept it. In fact, they even accepted travel money

from the taxpayers to go home for a Christmas vacation.

If the Speaker and his followers would also give up their pay as I am, I believe the House would quickly vote to reopen the Government. Maybe if they went without pay for a while, they would find out what it is like when you are working but not getting paid. They would learn that the bills keep coming even though the paychecks do not, which is what thousands of Federal workers in Vermont and throughout the country are now finding out.

My family is no different than any of the other hundreds of Vermont families that are going to miss that paycheck because of this shutdown. I will not enjoy my pay if they cannot enjoy theirs.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 2:43 p.m. took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 5:47 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BOND).

NOMINATION JOINTLY REFERRED TO COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Stuart E. Eizenstat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade, received on January 4, 1996, be jointly referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Thomas, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting one nomination which was jointly referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and to the Committee on Finance.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Goetz, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 1530) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated; the said bill did not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message also announced the House proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 2076) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated; the said bill did not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

At 1:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2029) to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to provide regulatory relief, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING RECESS

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 4, 1995, the Secretary of the Senate, on January 4, 1996, during the recess of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 1925. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

H.R. 2203. An act to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

H.J. Res. 153. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House proceeded to reconsider the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, returned by the President of the United States with his objections, to the House of Representatives, in which it originated; the said bill did not pass, two-thirds of the House of Representatives not agreeing to pass the same.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–1764. A communication from the Director of the Office of Administration, the Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the personnel report for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1765. A communication from the Director of Commissioned Personnel, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps Retirement System; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1766. A communication from the Commmissioner of the Office of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the accountibility report for fiscal year 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1767. A communication from the Commisssioner of the Office of Social Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Office of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1768. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the valuation of the U.S. Coast Guard Military Retirement System for fiscal year 1994; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1769. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notice relative to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1770. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the semiannual report of the Inspector General for the period April 1 through September 30, 1995; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996 for the operations of the Passport Office of the Department of State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S.J. Res. 46. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996 for the operations of the Passport Office of the Department of State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PASSPORT OFFICE CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, we find ourselves in the 20th day of an untenable situation. Large parts of the

Federal Government are closed. Spending authority is suspended for 9 Cabinet departments and 38 agencies, commissions, and boards, which have responded by closing virtually all functions.

Prior to 1982, the Federal Government had never closed. This is now the 12th closing in 14 years. Recall that the British arrived in Washington in 1814. They burnt the White House. They burnt the Capitol. We still did not close down the Federal Government. In the 1930's, in the midst of the worst depression we have ever had, we kept the Federal Government open. We now have an army in the Balkans. They deserve a better example.

One critical service forced to close is the Passport Office of the Department of State. Last night, the Senate passed a continuing resolution attached to H.R. 1643 and the majority leader's back-to-work bill, S. 1508. Both of these measures would reopen our passport offices. But, apparently, the House may balk at approving these eminently reasonable and logical measures. Accordingly, I rise to introduce legislation to reopen the Passport Office. Last year 5.3 million Americans applied for passports. This year the agency expects a record 5.6 million applications. Today, the Washington Post reports that the Government closing has created a backlog of 200,000 passport applications. This is no way to begin a record-breaking year at the Passport Office.

Speaking of the backlog of passport applications is perhaps too callous. All of these applications were submitted by citizens who expect that the Federal Government will provide them with a passport so they can travel to other countries to conduct business, study, visit family and friends, and vacation. Two hundred and fifty constituents have contacted my office seeking assistance; however, the passport office will only issue passports in cases considered life or death emergencies. One man was unable to attend his daughter's wedding in London because his passport had expired and could not be renewed. Another who is employed abroad fears losing his job if he cannot get his passport renewed. For years, we badgered the Soviet Union to grant more passports to its citizens. Now we are denying them to our own.

Article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, ratified by the U.S. Senate on April 2, 1992, recognizes that ''Everyone shall be free to leave any country, including his own.'' This is a binding international obligation of the United States, yet we have now taken action which violates that covenant.

A 1- or 2-day delay might be considered a nuisance. For this to continue for 3 weeks leads to incalculable waste, as people are forced to cancel plans and seek refunds for reservations. This is not just. Closing passport offices and other large swaths of the Federal Government erodes the confidence of all Americans, disrupts the lives of those who rely on Government services, and discourages Federal workers. Clearly we have entered an Orwellian realm in which employees are paid not to work so that negotiations to save money can continue.

The Founders of our Nation were astute students of government. They searched history to analyze the strengths and weaknesses of various political systems as they debated and later formed our own Government. They perceived how government power is derived from the consent of the governed. They perceived how government power is derived from the consent of the governed. In the Declaration of Independence they reveal their insights:

> We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, . . . Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient Causes;

Governance is a covenant between the people and their leaders. Perhaps not since secession has that covenant been so trampled. The closing of the Government ought never have begun. Now we should end it without further delay. At a minimum, we should reopen our passport offices.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 912

At the request of Mr. KOHL, the name of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the eligibility of veterans for mortgage revenue bond financing, and for other purposes.

S. 1453

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Texas [Mrs. HUTCHISON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1453, a bill to prohibit the regulation by the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Commissioner of Food and Drugs of any activities of sponsors or sponsorship programs connected with, or any advertising used or purchased by, the Professional Rodeo Cowboy Association, its agents or affiliates, or any other professional rodeo association, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE ROAD TO MOUNT RUSHMORE IS A BALANCED BUDGET

● Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, Mount Rushmore, set in the heart of the Black Hills National Forest, was created as a shrine to America's democracy. As a powerful American symbol, it is the jewel of the National Park System. Like all other units of the National Park System, Mount Rushmore was forced to close as part of the Government shutdown on December 15, 1995.

However, thanks to the extraordinary dedication of one man, Mount Rushmore will remain illuminated for all to see during this dark period preceding fiscal responsibility. Mr. Art Oakes has graciously donated funds to ensure that the monument is able to remain lit for the more than 2 million visitors it receives each year.

I share with all Americans the frustration that the Federal Government remains partially shut down. It is clear that Americans want a balanced budget and are willing to shoulder the burden to get it done.

Mr. Oakes has shown us just how dedicated Americans are to a balanced budget. He is willing to give up his own hard-earned money to help Mount Rushmore through this shutdown crisis. He recognizes that Mount Rushmore is not just a park, but a symbol of what America represents—both to other Americans and to tourists from overseas.

Today, my wife Harriet and I would like to show our support for Mr. Oakes' efforts by donating $200 for continuing the nightly illumination of the Mount Rushmore monument.

As many of you may know, Mount Rushmore was designed in 1927 by Gutzon Borglum, the son of Danish immigrants. The monument is a shrine of American Presidential heroes: George Washington, Father of the Nation; Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence; Theodore Roosevelt, conservationist and trustbuster; and Abraham Lincoln, the Great Emancipator and preserver of the Union.

More than 65 years later, Mount Rushmore is still one of the most powerful symbols of America. It represents the freedom of democracy, the melting pot country which offers the hope of a better life. Yet how can we continue to promise a better life if our President refuses to agree on a plan to balance the budget?

We need a balanced budget. The American people want and deserve an end to shamelessly wasteful spending programs. Washington must operate under a budget where we live within our means—as people in my home State of South Dakota do every day.

I feel passionately that we must give the dream of America—represented by Mount Rushmore—back to our children. We can do that only if Bill Clinton agrees on a balanced budget. I want the National Park Service and the rest of the Federal Government back at work and fully functioning. This will happen if Bill Clinton agrees on a balanced budget. It is that simple. Bill Clinton should stop stalling and start leading. He should support our goal of a balanced budget.●

CONGRATULATIONS TO CONGRESSMAN KWEISI MFUME

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I am most pleased to join with the citizens of Baltimore and Maryland in expressing warmest congratulations to Congressman KWEISI MFUME upon his appointment as president and chief executive of the NAACP. Those of us privileged to have worked closely with Congressman MFUME are convinced that the NAACP, the African-American community, and all Americans of goodwill will be well served by this appointment. It is an inspired choice.

KWEISI MFUME's accomplishments compellingly demonstrate the quality, strength, and determination of his character. Against great odds, Congressman MFUME overcame what would be considered for most people insurmountable obstacles in shaping his life and career. In his first elected office, he established an outstanding record for public service as a member of the City Council of Baltimore. This was followed by service in the U.S. House of Representatives where as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, he led that group with exceptional effectiveness and vision.

It is very encouraging that the NAACP Board of Trustees has called upon Congressman MFUME's leadership at such a critical time in the history of the organization and of the civil rights struggle. He brings to this demanding responsibility unique dimensions of perception and experience. His longtime grassroots involvement has equipped him with a special understanding of needs of individuals and community groups, while his proven and tested national leadership gives him a unique knowledge of the realities and demands of the public and private sectors. These insights and experiences will greatly benefit the NAACP.

Congressman MFUME's appointment further solidifies the historic and productive relationship between Baltimore and the NAACP, whose national headquarters is located in our city. He follows in the footsteps of other distinguished Baltimoreans who were critical to civil rights progress: the late, great Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall, who led the relentless effort which finally brought down the legal structure of segregation; Clarence Mitchell, Jr., the NAACP's chief Washington lobbyist, whose legislative genius was critical to the passage of every landmark piece of civil rights legislation and, Dr. Lilly Jackson and Ms. Enolia MacMillan, two courageous leaders of Maryland's NAACP who inspired their counterparts throughout America.

Congressman MFUME's presence will be deeply missed in the Congress. But, like another esteemed colleague, former Representative William Gray, now the President of the United Negro College Fund, he is continuing the struggle for justice and equality in a newer arena.

I salute the NAACP for this outstanding appointment and pledge to continue working with its members and new leader in the continuing struggle for an America which provides opportunity and fairness for all its citizens. I ask to have printed in the RECORD several articles from the Baltimore Afro-American, the Baltimore Jewish Times, the Baltimore Sun, the New York Times, and the Washington Post describing the achievements and life of this extraordinary man and the great challenges which lie ahead for him.

The articles follow:

[From the Baltimore Afro-American, Dec. 16, 1995]

NEW HOPE AT THE NAACP

It borders on the ironic that after a nationwide and lengthy search to find a new leader for the much beleaguered NAACP, the right candidate—and some would say the perfect candidate—came from the same city where the association has its headquarters—Baltimore.

In selecting Rep. Kweisi Mfume as its President/CEO the NAACP—to use an apt description—has struck oil. Rarely has the naming of an individual to such high profile position been greeted with such an unanimous chorus of approval, from the President of the United States, to the man and woman in the street.

If ever things were meant to be, then probably it was meant to be that Mr. Mfume would be called upon to resurrect the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization, and that he would respond at the cost of giving up a seat in the U.S. Congress to which he could have been reelected as long as he wished.

A more qualified candidate—and here we are not simply talking about what appears on paper but what's inside—would be most difficult to find. It is as if the man and the job were waiting for each other.

There are the challenges ahead for Mr. Mfume of eliminating the $3 million plus debt, rebuilding staff, redefining the role of the NAACP, rebuilding bridges of understanding that his immediate predecessors destroyed, and above all, restoring the faith of people in the NAACP.

This is a tall order, but we believe Mr. Mfume is the right person, in the right place, at the right time, to fill it.

He can not do this however, unless the African American people, who have always been the rock on which the NAACP stood, rally now to its support.

Either through donations, or memberships, or a combination of both, it is imperative that all of us join Mr. Mfume in a grand and glorious campaign to set matters right at the NAACP.

Without it, we would indeed be in dire straits.

[From the Baltimore Jewish Times, Dec. 15, 1995]

MFUME'S ADVANCEMENT

Rep. Kweisi Mfume's decision last week to leave Congress and assume the leadership of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People is an important development for a black community that needs strong and farsighted leadership to fight the unprecedented attack on the civil rights advances of the past half-century now underway in Washington. It also is welcome news for a Jewish community that remains concerned about the decay of our cities, and rising signs of black anti-Semitism.

Rep. Mfume's story—his rise from a life on the streets and the kinds of social problems that have become epidemic in our cities—is legend in Baltimore. And he has become, as described by Baltimore Jewish Council Executive Director Arthur C. Abramson ''a strong and supportive friend of the Jewish community.'' (See ''A Friend, In Deed,'' on Page 22.)

His tenure as chair of the Congressional Black Caucus was not without controversy; it was Rep. Mfume, after all, who suggested a ''covenant'' between the influential congressional group and Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan. But he also helped give the caucus a new prominence and ability to help shape the national agenda.

These are discouraging times in Congress—for Democrats and black legislators, in particular. The civil rights agenda is under assault; important social programs that have helped keep stabilize cities despite growing poverty and growing despair are being decimated.

Rep. Mfume faced an extraordinary choice; stay in a safe congressional seat, and fight from within to head off the most sweeping Republican cuts—or work to rebuild an organization that was once the towering giant of the civil rights movement, but which has failed to adjust to the harsh realities of the 1990s.

Rep. Mfume's decision for the latter reflects his deep commitment to his people and to a nation that can no longer afford to turn a blind eye to the agony of our cities.

Rep. Mfume, who has worked closely with Jewish leaders over the years, can provide the soul for a revitalized alliance that should benefit both communities.

Kain Y'hee Ratzon, Rep. Mfume.

So may it be.

[From the Washington Post]

A FIGHTER IN THE PUBLIC ARENA—IN MFUME, NAACP HIRES A DIRECTOR IT HOPES CAN PUSH IT TO RECLAIM ITS HISTORIC LEADERSHIP

(By Hamil R. Harris and Michael A. Fletcher)

In choosing Rep. Kweisi Mfume as its new leader, the NAACP reached out to a former street fighter and seasoned politician to take on a daunting array of internal and external challenges facing the historic civil rights organization.

NAACP officials hope Mfume (D–Md.), who was named president and chief executive officer Saturday, can bridge the divide between blacks and whites, battle the increasingly powerful congressional conservatives and heal the internal divisions that have crippled the organization in recent years.

''The organization needed a jolt of electricity, and he is exactly the man to give it to them,'' veteran civil rights activist Roger Wilkins said yesterday. His uncle, Roy Wilkins, headed the NAACP for years.

Mfume ''is a man who understands the streets. He also has operated in the highest policy spheres in the United States. He is smart, he is tough, and he has integrity,'' Wilkins said. For Mfume, the job offers a chance to broaden his role as a national black leader by reaching out to a new generation of activists while reassuring the old guard of the civil rights establishment, who form the core of the NAACP's support. He has pledged to work to recruit young people and others who have seen the NAACP, the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization, as elitist and increasingly irrelevant.

''The time is now for a new generation to join the NAACP,'' Mfume, 47, said during his acceptance speech Saturday. ''While we value maturity and experience, we must learn to cherish youth. . . . I reach out to the current generation and say to you in the clearest terms that it is all right to come back home to the NAACP.'' Baltimore

NAACP member Kobi Little, 24, welcomed Mfume's comments. He is suing the organization because youth members, ages 17 and younger, are barred from voting in branch and national elections. ''I think it will mean good things for the organization,'' he said.

Mfume is in his fifth term representing Baltimore's predominantly black 7th Congressional District in the House. In 1992, he was elected and served for two years as chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, when it enjoyed the peak of its power working with a Democratic president and a Democratic majority in Congress. He plans to resign from the House and assume his new post Feb. 15. ''We are at the crossroads of tremendous change in our nation,'' Mfume said. ''Despite the gains made by African Americans, racism continues to divide our country and polarize our people. We can stand by and watch in the comfort of our own circumstances, or we can step forward and dare to lead.''

Mfume has scored his first victory by uniting the fractious NAACP board behind his selection, which was unopposed, despite some board members' previous plans to challenge the search committee's candidate. The challenge ''never materialized,'' said board member Joe Madison, who was a finalist for the job. ''I'm just ecstatic about the choice and relieved that someone of the stature of the congressman would step up and take the job.''

Mfume said he plans to reach out to the NAACP's historic allies in the corporate and white communities. He also plans to make a ''long list'' of courtesy calls on national black figures, including Nation of Islam leader Louis Farrakhan.

Mfume's selection won cautious praise from Jewish activists who traditionally have supported the NAACP but have been alarmed in recent years by its overtures to Farrakhan, whose rhetoric has been denounced as antisemitic.

Abraham H. Foxman, national director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, hailed Mfume's selection yesterday. He said, ''We need the NAACP to be strong and active and to be a major voice for civil rights, for unity, and to fight discrimination.''

But he added: ''I will have a problem if he looks to Farrakhan for leadership. I hope and believe he will not.'' Born Frizzell Gray in West Baltimore, Mfume—in the words of poet Langston Hughes—didn't ascend to power on a crystal staircase. He dropped out of school and fathered five sons by four women by age 22.

Gray hung out on street corners, got into fights and drifted between menial jobs. But he changed his life as radically as he changed his name. He said the name, which is of African derivation, translates as ''conquering son of kings.''

Mfume received a degree in urban planning from Morgan State University and became a talk show host on the college's radio station. Mfume championed issues of the poor and the disenfranchised and won a seat on the Baltimore City Council in 1979. NAACP board member and civil rights activist Julian Bond was on the search committee that selected Mfume. Bond said that what is at stake now is the very survival of the NAACP—''its future, its very existence.''

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 15, 1995]

BIG CHOICE FOR KWEISI MFUME—AND THE NAACP

(By William Raspberry)

Every now and then someone will make a choice that, however little you might have anticipated it, immediately strikes you as brilliant—even obvious.

That's my reaction to the NAACP's selection of Kweisi Mfume to be its new leader. The 47-year-old Baltimore congressman was nowhere on my list of candidates for the job; I'd simply never thought of him in that connection. But as soon as I heard that he'd been chosen, I could only think: Yes!

Clearly, it's a brilliant choice for the troubled organization as it wrestles with the difficulties of changing directions without losing its fundamental character. Mfume is young enough, savvy enough and ''street'' enough to deal with the young people his predecessor, the Rev. Benjamin Chavis, tried to reach during his foreshortened tenure. As a fifth-term congressman, former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and widely respected civic and political leader, he is experienced enough and solid enough to instill confidence in the rest of his potential constituency.

Nor, now that I think of it, is it a bad choice for Mfume himself. He may have been close to the limit of his political influence and patience, given the country's tightening purse strings and rightward movement. The NAACP leadership gives him a shot at leadership on a new, higher, more effective level.

But even brilliant choices are not guaranteed success. If Mfume will permit a word of caution from an admirer:

The NAACP is, in some ways, two organizations—one devoted to a glorious past of fighting Jim Crow, school segregation and laws calculated to limit black advancement; the other groping for relevancy at a time when so many of black America's problems (though arguably spawned by racism) are perpetuated and exacerbated by our own inappropriate choices and behavior.

Kweisi Mfume is also two men—the one accepting the traditional view that racism is our number one problem, the other bold enough to see the need for blacks to change their behavior, no matter what white people do or fail to do.

Which Mfume is taking charge of the NAACP? His acceptance speech of last Saturday offers a small clue. ''We are at the crossroads of tremendous change in our nation,'' he said. ''Despite the gains made by African Americans, racism continues to divide our country and polarize our people. We can stand by and watch in the comfort of our own circumstances, or we can step forward and dare to lead.''

A guaranteed applause line, that. And yet I hear myself asking: Lead where? For if he is talking about leading a fight against racism, I fear he is missing the boat. Racism has not disappeared from American life; far from it. But I really do believe that it is no longer the main barrier to black progress—particularly among those of us most in need of progress. Does Mfume?

Like most of us, I suppose he is of two minds. The recent settlement of cases involving discrimination at Denny's restaurants, the humiliation of two innocent black teenagers by security people at the Eddie Bauer's outlet in suburban Washington, the race killing of two civilians by white supremacist soldiers from Fort Bragg, N.C.—all these things and more counsel vigilance against racism. Mfume understands that.

But he understands something else: that lasting change must come from within. It wasn't racism that made Mfume (then known as Frizzell Gray) a violent, street-running dropout who fathered five sons by three women—all ''without benefit of clergy.'' And it wasn't the defeat of racism that helped him to turn his life around.

He's not sure precisely what it was. But he does know that once he made the decision to get himself together, to make something of himself, he had lots of help and advice from people who had it to give. There is something deeply inspirational about his journey from irresponsible street bum to respected leader who, by the way, took the trouble to build a relationship with his sons.

Which experience should guide his efforts to reach out to young blacks, as he has vowed to do: the humiliations of racism or the power of decision? They may be equally authentic, but, as his own life teaches, they are not equally effective at producing.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1995]

MFUME: NOT JUST LEADER, A SAVIOR TO N.A.A.C.P.

(By Steven A. Holmes)

WASHINGTON, December 10.—When Representative Kweisi Mfume walked into a hotel conference room here to interview with the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People on Saturday, the group broke out into spontaneous applause. It was perhaps the first time in more than two years the full board had found anything to cheer about.

For an organization mired in debt and increasingly accused of being archaic and out of touch, Mr. Mfume, who was named on Saturday as the N.A.A.C.P.'s president and chief executive officer, is viewed by many within the civil rights group as a savior. So much so that the descriptions of him that flow from some quarters lapse effortlessly into hyperbole.

''In our new president we have the brilliance of Dubois, the eloquence of Martin Luther King, the toughness of Thurgood Marshall, the caring of Ms. Bethune and Harriet Tubman and Sojourner Truth,'' A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., a retired Federal Judge said, comparing Mr. Mfume to a pantheon of icons of the anti-slavery and civil rights movements.

While neither Mr. Mfume nor anyone else could be such a giant, he clearly provides skills, outlook, visibility and a personal story that could help revive the ailing organization.

Born Frizzell Gray in Baltimore in 1948, Mr. Mfume spent his early years under the hand of an abusive stepfather who, until Mr. Mfume's mother divorced him, beat his wife and belittled his stepson. When Mr. Mfume was 16, his mother died of cancer, leaving him feeling alone and abandoned.

For several years, Mr. Mfume went through what he later called his ''lost years,'' dropping out of high school, hanging out on the tough streets of the city's west side, where he was known by his nickname of Pee Wee, and fathering five children out of wedlock by four different women.

''I came out of a disjointed family structure,'' Mr. Mfume said in a speech last year. ''I grew up in the worst possible conditions. I became homeless after my mother's death, hit the streets and dropped out of school, flirted with every temptation that was around, became a teen parent before my time, felt left out and victimized.''

But Mr. Mfume grabbed hold of his life. He earned a high school equivalency diploma, attended Morgan State University, a historically black college in Baltimore, and later gained a reputation as a disk jockey and radio talk show host. Along the way he took a new name (pronounced Kwah-EEE-see Oom-FOO-may), which in a Ghanaian dialect means ''conquerer of kings.''

''It's different,'' Mr. Mfume once said of his name. ''So is Zbigniew Brzezinski.''

After seven years as a member of the Baltimore City Council, Mr. Mfume was the surprise victor of a 1986 Democratic Primary to replace retiring Representative Parren J. Mitchell. In the heavily Democratic district, the win virtually guaranteed election to Congress. He has been reelected four times, often gaining more than 80 percent of the vote in the general election.

As a Representative, Mr. Mfume made his mark as Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus from 1992 to 1994, a time when the number of blacks in the House shot up to 40 from 26.

With new-found strength because of its increased size, the caucus under Mr. Mfume flexed its muscles as never before. It pointedly chastized President Clinton for bowing to criticism and withdrawing Lani Guinier, a professor at the University of Pennsylvania Law School, as his nominee for Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights.

The caucus also pressed Mr. Clinton to use American troops to restore ousted Haitian President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to power, one of the few groups to do so publicly for what was considered by many to be a hopeless cause.

Mr. Mfume's tenure as head of the caucus was not without its missteps. In 1992, he angered Jews and some members of the Caucus when he declared that the group had entered into a ''sacred covenant'' with the Nation of Islam.

In the face of criticism and in the wake of an anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and anti-white speech by one of Mr. Farrakhan's aides, Khalid Abdul Mohammed, Mr. Mfume disavowed any association with the group and spent much time mending fences with Jewish leaders in Baltimore.

As a five-term Representative from Baltimore, where the N.A.A.C.P. is based, Mr. Mfume brings political acumen to the civil rights group, the country's oldest but one whose political relevancy has been questioned in recent years. He has shown an ability to raise money, a skill badly needed for a group saddled with a $3.2 million debt. As a former Baltimore street tough who turned his life around, he also lends credibility to a message of personal responsibility for black youths.

''The time is now—right now—to restore the financial, spiritual and political health of this historic, American institution,'' Mr. Mfume said at a news conference following the board's decision. He added, ''And my job is to provide the leadership that will make that happen.''

His career has been free of scandal, a stark contrast to the recent history of the N.A.A.C.P. In the last two years, the organization has fired its executive director amid charges of sexual discrimination and harassment and replaced a board chairmen who was accused of financial improprieties.

With his handsome looks, smooth manner and current girlfriend—an actress, Lynn Whitfield, who won an Emmy Award in 1991 for her portrayal of Josephine Baker in a cable television movie—he brings a measure of glamour to an organization sometimes seen as frumpy.

At his news conference on Saturday, Mr. Mfume spoke of the need for the N.A.A.C.P. to maintain a commitment to coalition politics with whites and others. In doing so, he appeared to be trying to assuage the concerns of some whites and blacks who had been put off by the attempts by Benjamin F. Chavis Jr., the former executive director, to align the organization with Mr. Farrakhan, who preaches a black separatist ideology.

''It is easier to accomplish things when you maximize the number of people who you have working with you and working for you,'' he said in an interview.

As a condition of taking the job, Mr. Mfume wrested concessions from the N.A.A.C.P. board, which since the mid-1980's has taken much power and control from the organization's chief executive but has fallen short in raising money and in debating and formulating policy.

Rather than report to a 64-member board, Mr.. Mfume will deal with a smaller executive committee and have the authority to hire and fire staff, a power that had been stripped from the top executive. And to denote who will be in charge, his title will be president and chief executive officer, not executive director.

The need to symbolically change the position back to president—something, although small—was powerful in terms of what is said about the position,'' he said in an interview.

One unknown question, however, is Mr. Mfume's administrative skills. As member of Congress, and before that, the Baltimore City Council, Mr. Mfume has never had to run an organization as large as the N.A.A.C.P. But officials of the organization say they are not overly concerned.

''If that becomes a problem, we could get him a manager,'' said one board member who spoke on condition of anonymity. ''Because he brings so much else, if he's weak there, we could prop him up.''

[From the Baltimore Sun, Dec. 10, 1995]

MFUME TRANSFORMED HIMSELF

MATURING: AS HE PROGRESSED FROM THE BALTIMORE CITY COUNCIL TO THE U.S. CONGRESS, KWEISI MFUME DEVELOPED INTO A POLISHED CONSENSUS BUILDER

(By Tom Bowman and Karen Hosler)

''We are going to change,'' Rep. Kweisi Mfume declared yesterday after being chosen to head the NAACP.

He could have been talking about himself. Kweisi Mfume, 47, began his political career as a dashiki-clad political activist on the Baltimore City Council. But when he arrived on Capitol Hill, he quickly transformed himself into a polished consensus builder.

Battling Mayor Donald Schaefer and Council President Clarence H. ''Du'' Burns, he first ran in 1979 on a campaign to ''beat the bosses,'' advocating for the poor and the powerless.

After two terms on the council, he decided in 1986 to make a run for the seat of Rep. Parren J. Mitchell, a retiring civil rights legend who served 16 years in the House. Defeating a Republican, St. George I. B. Crosse III, in a bitter contest for the 7th District seat, he embarked on a bridge-building effort, forging a relationship with Governor Schaefer.

The dashikis gave way to finely tailored dark suits. The once-angry voice took on a measured and mellifluous cadence. ''I'm the same fighter, but the arena has changed,'' he explained once. ''Sometimes I will do it by compromise, sometimes I will do it through confrontation.''

He reached out to all his constituencies, from Catonsville to West Baltimore to Charles Village to East Baltimore and Hampden. Some white areas in the district had felt snubbed by Mr. Mitchell.

The new congressman set up town meetings with his neighboring Democrat, Rep. Benjamin L. Cardin, and followed his predecessor, Mr. Mitchell, to the House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs Committee.

But Mr. Mfume became more adept at dealing with the opposition than was the often-acerbic Mr. Mitchell. ''Mfume's style is, 'You'll like me and respect me,'" Daniel P. Henson III, the city housing commissioner, said several years ago. ''Parren's style was, 'You may not like me, but you'll respect me.'"

On the Banking Committee, Mr. Mfume matured into a skilled legislative craftsman. He was instrumental in saving programs that aided minority businesses. And he embraced issues outside the traditional black agenda, from high-technology development to business tax breaks.

Within two years, he became a leader in the Congressional Black Caucus, which elected him one of two vice chairmen.

''He's serious. He's thoughtful, He's a consensus builder,'' Rep. Mike Espy, a Mississippi Democrat, said in December 1992, when Mr. Mfume was elected chairman of the Black Caucus.

With his elevation to caucus chair and the election of a Democratic president, Mr. Mfume found his profile rising in Washington. President Clinton desperately needed the votes of the 39-member Black Caucus to get his legislative agenda through Congress.

As head of the group, Mr. Mfume proved a tough negotiator and a shrewd bargainer, often holding out for concessions from Mr. Clinton on programs such as the tax credit for the working poor. The man who once had a popular radio talk show on Morgan State's WEAA now became a fixture on the nationally televised Sunday TV talk shows.

The Black Caucus, under Mr. Mfume, provided Mr. Clinton with critical votes for his crime bill, despite deep-held opposition to death penalty provisions.

Mr. Mfume's term as caucus chairman had its stormy moments. He made many of his more traditional colleagues uncomfortable by reaching out to the Nation of Islam and its chairman, Louis Farrakhan, who has a history of making inflammatory remarks about Jews and other groups.

But after Republicans took control of Congress this year, the Black Caucus members were mere voices in the wilderness. Because the caucus members are among the most liberal in Congress, few found any common ground with the ruling Republicans.

Mr. Mfume found himself in an unhappy eclipse. Once surrounded by reporters every time he left the House floor, the Baltimore Democrat could recently be seen ambling alone past the press-mobbed Republican leaders.

No longer in the majority party, he would become the 20th House Democrat to leave or announce plans to do so. Five others have switched to join the GOP.

When Mr. Mfume assumed the leadership role in the Black Caucus three years ago, Mr. Espy offered words that would apply today as Mr. Mfume assumes the leadership of the NAACP.

''He has a professional style, which we need,'' Mr. Espy said in 1992. ''It will be difficult. I know he's up to the job.''●

FDA REVIEW OF OLESTRA

● Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I rise to comment on the decision currently before the Food and Drug Administration regarding the Procter & Gamble Co.'s petition for its food additive, olestra.

Olestra is a fat-free food additive invented by the Procter & Gamble Co. This synthetic cooking oil and the decision by FDA are the subject of this week's Time magazine cover story.

The scientific issues under review by FDA are fascinating and I commend FDA for its management of the review by the Food Advisory Committee.

The Procter & Gamble Co. undertook its efforts to better understand fat in the human body in the 1950's and developed olestra in the 1960's. In 1971, Procter & Gamble began the approval process at FDA.

More than two decades later, olestra has not yet been approved. Nobody is faulting the FDA; approval of olestra has posed unique and unprecedented scientific questions that had to be researched. Accordingly, the FDA has approached this unprecedented food additive with appropriate prudence, and

Procter & Gamble was required to invent new protocols to test olestra's safety for human consumption.

Regulatory review by the FDA is necessary to ensure the public health and safety. At the same time I believe that we should encourage innovation by American industry. I believe that unnecessary delay in the approval of new products will have a negative impact on the investment in research and development. Without the FDA approval, olestra cannot be manufactured for and used by the Nation's consumers. Procter & Gamble has invested more than $200 million in the development of this product and expects to invest many more millions to construct manufacturing facilities should olestra be approved. Therefore, I am pleased that the FDA has indicated that it will complete its decisionmaking process very soon.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of my letter of December 13, 1995, to Commissioner Kessler of the FDA be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, December 13, 1995.

DAVID A. KESSLER, M.D.,
Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Park Lawn Building, Rockville, MD.

DEAR MR. COMMISSIONER: I am writing in regard to the food additive petition for olestra, the non-calorie fat substitute. Because of olestra's development by the Ohio based Procter & Gamble Company, I have been interested in the product and its review by the FDA. I am pleased to hear that the Food Advisory Committee has recommended to the FDA that olestra meets the statutory standard of ''reasonable certainty of no harm.''

I want to commend FDA for its management of the Food Advisory Committee review process. It is my understanding that based upon an objective scientific process, no significant new safety issues were raised and no new data raising concern were introduced. I further understand that the issues of labeling statements and postmarketing surveillance raised by Committee members were addressed and agreed to by Procter & Gamble prior to the meeting.

FDA's commitment to further the process is certainly evidenced by the November 13 publication of the Federal Register notice announcing that all data, information and public comments on the petition were to be filed by December 1 in order to facilitate the FDA decision making process. I am pleased that the notice also indicated that the FDA intends to render a decision within 60 days of the conclusion of the Food Advisory Committee meeting provided no significant new safety issues are raised. Given the favorable review by the advisory committee and the absence of significant new safety issues or concerns, I believe that the FDA should take the necessary steps to ensure that the decision making process is completed within the timetable on or about January 17, 1996. I look forward to the final agency action on the olestra petition.

Best regards.
Sincerely,

JOHN GLENN,
U.S. Senator.●

(At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

OUTSTANDING ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN WISCONSIN COLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

● Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize two outstanding accomplishments in Wisconsin collegiate athletics. Over the weekend of December 9–10, 1995, two Wisconsin schools were crowned as national champions. On Saturday, December 9, the University of Wisconsin-La Crosse captured the NCAA Division III Football Championship, by defeating Rowan, NJ, 36 to 7 in the Amos Alonzo Stagg Bowl, held in Salem, VA. Also finding success in the Commonwealth of Virginia, the University of Wisconsin claimed their first NCAA Division I Men's Soccer Title, downing Duke University, 2 to 0 in Richmond. Both championships can be attributed to a team first attitude, and a work ethic that is second-to-none.

Behind an uncompromising defense that allowed just 153 yards, including yielding only 4 yards during the 3d quarter, and a balanced offensive attack that amassed 451 yards, the UW-La Crosse Eagles earned their second national title in 4 years. Although they trailed Rowan early in the game, the ''never-say-die'' Eagles went on to score 36 unanswered points including an 85-yard scoring strike by senior All-American quarterback, and Division III Player of the Year, Craig Kusick, that seemed to decimate the valiant efforts of the Rowan defense. Inspired by their offensive counterparts, the unrelenting Eagle defense held Rowan scoreless for the final three quarters, and gave UW-La Crosse the lead for good after tackle Mike Ivey stopped an overmatched Rowan back for a safety. The championship marks the second Division III title for Eagle head coach Roger Harring and caps off his 27th season with an undefeated campaign, 14–0.

Defense has also been the key on the road to the Badgers' title run. While allowing only 11 goals all season, and never more than 2 in a game, the Wisconsin defense continued to stonewall its opponents by becoming the first team ever to go through the entire five-game tournament without allowing a goal. The 2-to-0 victory over Duke in the final extended their shutout string to 7 consecutive games and the 17th blanking over their 25-game schedule. Truly a team effort, Coach Jim Launder's Badgers were the first Wisconsin team to advance past the NCAA quarterfinal.

There is a cliche that says, ''Offense wins games. Defense wins championships.'' Although somewhat simplistic, it can be no more true than in the results of the championships attained by our fine Wisconsin universities. Wisconsin is truly proud of all its student athletes, and on behalf of the State of Wisconsin, I salute our national champions for their dedication to their common goal and for a job well done.●

TRIBUTE TO PATTY CALLAGHAN, ACTION FOR EASTERN MONTANA, GLENDIVE

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I wish today to give tribute to one of eastern Montanan's treasures, Patty Callaghan. Patty recently retired after 20 years with Action for Eastern Montana.

Patty retired as executive director to attend Luther Seminary in St. Paul, MN. She hopes to return to eastern Montana as a lay leader with rural churches.

Montana needs more leaders like Patty Callaghan. Rural Montana needs the love for and knowledge of our State that people like Patty have.

Patty's work with Action actually led to her decision to choose the seminary. When funding cutbacks in the programs that she administers forced her to look to other resources, Patty found the churches responding generously. She found the needs of rural communities to be much the same as the need of rural congregations—energy, leadership for change, accountability, respect, and compassion.

Patty has dealt with many family issues that will serve her will in her new life. She found the work at Action for Eastern Montana rewarding and the Glendive community generous when a need was identified.

In a recent tribute to Patty, family members, coworkers, friends, and many others including Montana's Governor Marc Racicot expressed their respect and appreciation for her life's work.

I would also like to express my profound respect and admiration for Patty Callaghan and what she has done for eastern Montana. Public service can bring out the best and worst in people. With Patty, her compassion and caring has only deepened. Eastern Montana desperately needs this commitment to its communities.

Thank you, Patty. We wish you the best and look forward to seeing you again soon.●

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1996

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Friday; that following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be deemed approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and there then be a period for morning business until the hour of 12 noon with Senator permits to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DOLE. For the information of all of our colleagues, negotiations with the Republican and Democrat leadership, the White House, and the President will continue tomorrow to see if

we can reach some agreement on a balanced budget. I also believe there will be a meeting on Saturday afternoon, maybe into the evening. We do not expect any rollcall votes during Friday's session of the Senate.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, it had been our thought we might remain in session tonight because the House may take action with reference to our deeming resolution which passed here the other day. There will be a House Republican conference at 7 o'clock. They have not yet passed, and I do not know precisely what, if anything, will pass, but we wanted to be here if something passed later this evening. I now understand that would be objected to—an effort to do it tonight—so if there is any action it would come tomorrow. I had hoped we would do it tonight because if it passed Federal employees could be back to work tomorrow morning. I know that is the hope of the Senator from Virginia who has been working on this on a daily basis. We have had meetings throughout the day on the balanced budget amendment and we have also talked about Federal employees. Speaker GINGRICH is very forthcoming. I know he has been in meetings throughout the day.

I think all of us regret the deadline of January 3 passed without reaching a balanced budget agreement. We have not given up. We will be back, as I said, negotiating tomorrow afternoon and probably Saturday afternoon. I would say perhaps by the weekend or sometime early next week we probably ought to have some agreement—or disagreement, maybe; that we cannot put it together. But we have not reached that point yet. I will keep everybody informed.

If there are any rollcall votes, as I have indicated to the Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE, there would be at least 24 hours' notice provided to our colleagues.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I again salute our distinguished majority leader. I know how hard he has worked on this.

I have been in consultation with my colleagues from Virginia in the House of Representatives, and most specifically Congressman DAVIS, here, within the hour.

As you state, the House will have its caucus tonight. I, just speaking for myself, am optimistic, without going into the details, that there will be some action. Therefore, if that is done, it is likely that this body, the Senate, would review it tomorrow, would that be correct?

Mr. DOLE. I would do it as quickly as we can. I thought if the House took it up in the morning it might be finished at 11 o'clock and we could take it up at any time it comes from the House.

I will say, as I said before, some of our House colleagues have a different view of this than some of us in the Senate; maybe not all of us in the Senate. But I also add, at least this Senator has been here the last couple of weeks doing a lot of the heavy lifting. We explored almost every option I can think of to get people back to work. I know that is the view of all the House Members, both Republicans and Democrats, that they should be working and they should be paid, and you should not pay people for not working. In this case the workers are willing.

I hope there will be some positive measure to come from the House tomorrow so we can take it up and pass it very quickly and then get back to where we ought to be, back on our message. Our message is balancing the budget over the next 7 years. It is not a Government shutdown. Our message is to balance the budget. That is what the American people want us to focus on, on both sides of the aisle. That, and a number of other issues like welfare reform and tax cuts for families with children.

In my view, the other message is an impediment. If you watch the evening news tonight you will probably see two or three stories on the Government shutdown but not one on the balanced budget, not one. So I think somewhere along the way we have gotten off message. I hope things will move along here, we will get back, get our work done.

I would think Members on both sides would like some free time this month or next month because we have sort of gone around the calendar here.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, again, I commend my distinguished colleague and friend, the majority leader. I know full well, having shared many of the hours here over the past couple of weeks with you, that you have done more than your share of the heavy lifting and you have explored in a very objective way, recognizing the diversity of views within our own party as well as across America. But the keystone is the balanced budget using the CBO figures. I am hopeful the President will recognize that obligation on his part to send to the Congress, as early as possible, such a balanced budget.

I think, when the history is written on this, the turning point in this classic chapter of our history will be when the distinguished majority leader stood right here, and I was privileged to be on the floor, and you said those important words, ''Enough is enough.'' That was the turning point.

Mr. DOLE. I thank Congressman WOLF and Congressman DAVIS and also Congresswoman MORELLA, because they have been working with us, with the Senator, with our office, and I know they have been working on the House side. They may be in a little better position to appreciate the importance of some early action because they have a great number of Federal employees in their districts. Obviously, they are very concerned.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President I would like to add Congressman BATEMAN. He joined with us in our regular daily meetings today because a significant part of the Federal establishment in Virginia is in the Tidewater, of which he is a Representative.

Mr. DOLE. That is true.

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. DOLE. If there be no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:54 p.m., recessed until Friday, January 5, 1996, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 4, 1996:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

STUART E. EIZENSTAT, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE JEFFREY E. GARTEN, RESIGNED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL EQUAL RIGHTS ACT

HON. CARDISS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Environmental Equal Rights Act to promote equity, justice, and community involvement in the selection of the location of waste facilities. My bill gets at the heart of the need to locate waste facilities in locations which minimize the total impact on the health and well-being of nearby residents from sources of contamination. It would establish a process for exercising our inherent rights respecting the development and evolution of our communities.

In the past, sites for many waste facilities have invariably been chosen for the wrong reasons. Since it is politically difficult to select any location, the choice has often come down to a question of political influence: Those with the least have lost.

The result is that too many facilities have been placed in communities populated largely by minorities and the poor. These sitings regularly occur irrespective of the suitability of the site, and of critical importance, irrespective of the degree to which the community is already exposed to the polluting facilities. It is a simple fact of life that these communities usually do not have the financial or political resources to compete on these issues with other neighborhoods. Consequently, as multiple facilities are placed in minority and poor communities, the residents of these communities face unjustifiably severe health hazards and have no vehicle with which to protect themselves from such exposures.

According to a 1992 University of Michigan study, the proportion of minorities in communities which have a commercial hazardous waste facility is about double that in communities without such facilities. The University of Michigan study found that, where two or more such facilities are located, the proportion of minorities is more than triple that of communities without a facility.

In a 1992 report, the Environmental Protection Agency corroborated the evidence of the disproportionate impact of contaminants or racial minority and low-income populations when it concluded that these groups experience higher than average exposures to selected air pollutants and hazardous waste facilities.

Currently, projected human health impacts of a new waste facility usually do not figure into the decision of whether or not to award a permit. Once again, recent studies have found that urban, minority communities are the most exposed to particulates, sulfates, and other contaminants.

The Environmental Equal Rights Act [EERA] would allow citizens of an environmentally disadvantaged community in which a waste facility has been proposed to be sited to challenge the siting. A successful challenge would prevent the issuance of a permit for construction and operation of the proposed facility.

A challenge would be based on whether the proposed facility is located within 2 miles of another waste facility, Superfund site, or facility that releases toxic contaminants; and whether it is in a community that has a higher than average percentage of low-income or minority residents. The petitioner would also have to show that the proposed facility may adversely affect the human health or the environmental quality of the community.

Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Equal Rights Act will equip environmentally disadvantaged communities with basic tools to protect their environment and the health of their residents. These tools are necessary to compensate communities that are underrepresented and have fewer resources with which to protect themselves. We should all be able to agree that underrepresentation is an unacceptable basis for exposing people to substances which can impair mental development and cause harmful health conditions. To stop short of providing these rights would perpetuate the gross injustices and exposures to risks that have become all too common.

INTRODUCTION OF THE ECONOMIC REVITALIZATION ACT

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce an important piece of legislation. This bill, the Economic Revitalization Act, would expand the Federal Government's role in encouraging local economic development efforts across the country.

Many communities across the country have experienced unprecedented job loss and economic dislocation in recent years. These communities are in desperate need of economic development activities that will provide new jobs and tax revenues.

Prior to my election to Congress, I served for a number of years as a member of the Pittsburgh City Council. My service on the city council provided me with substantial first-hand knowledge about the many difficult challenges facing State and local governments.

Since I left the city council to become a Member of Congress, the demands on State and local governments have increased substantially while the resources at their disposal have declined. In the last 15 years, the Federal Government has eliminated General Revenue Sharing and Urban Development Action Grants. It has also limited funding for programs like the Economic Development Administration and Community Development Block Grants.

At the same time, the Federal Government has imposed a number of unfunded mandates on State and local governments that require expensive new investments in infrastructure like water and sewage treatment facilities. Such investments have clearly improved many Americans' quality of life, but they have also consumed large portions of State and local governments' scarce capital budgets, which might otherwise have been used to foster economic development.

Something needs to be done to target Federal economic development assistance at our most troubled communities. The empowerment zone/enterprise community legislation enacted in 1993 was landmark legislation, but the law only authorized empowerment zones and enterprise communities in 104 areas around the country. There are many more communities in this country that need this kind of help. Moreover, while the EZ/EC program will provide much-needed Federal assistance to the designated EZ/EC communities, the program does not provide adequate resources even for these communities to successfully address the difficult social problems that they face.

Consequently, I introduced a bill in 1993—shortly after the enactment of the EZ/EC legislation—that would provide economic development assistance to all of the local governments across the country that qualified as distressed communities.

This legislation would establish a new type of tax-exempt private activity bond, the distressed community economic development bond. The distressed community economic development bond would be targeted at communities that have been hard hit by population loss, job loss, slow growth, or military base closings. Communities which meet the bill's criteria for designation as distressed communities could issue tax-exempt bonds to promote a wide range of economic development projects within their jurisdictions.

This legislation was not adopted in the 103d Congress, so I am introducing it again today. I believe that this legislation would provide economically hard-hit communities with the necessary means to foster economic growth and create new jobs.

I do not pretend that this initiative would solve all of the problems of our most troubled communities. It could, however, constitute part of the solution. In light of the sharp decline in Federal support for State and local governments in recent years—and the concurrent growth in federally imposed mandates on those same governments—congressional action to encourage economic development is long overdue.

I invite my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this much-needed legislation.

MARATHON GIRLS ARE FIELD HOCKEY CHAMPIONS AGAIN

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am asking today that my colleagues join me in saluting

the Marathon High School girls field hockey team for successfully defending their New York State class D championship.

The team won its second straight championship by defeating Morrisville-Eaton in a close and hard fought contest at Skidmore College in Saratoga Springs, NY.

As last year, the community welcomed the victorious Lady Olympians as they returned. The volunteer fire department once again stirred excitement with wailing sirens and flashing lights, leading a parade through the center of the village.

I want to congratulate the team and let them know I am very proud of their performance. In marking their accomplishment, we applaud all athletic endeavors of young women everywhere and give a deserved pat on the back to the adults who have provided the guidance and example that have made these players champions.

Those are the parents, the coaches, the administrators, and the fans who have encouraged and enjoyed the play all year long.

And while they have brought fame to themselves, they have made their friends and their school, not to mention their community, proud as well.

These young people have learned what it feels like to win, but more importantly the value of camaraderie, teamwork, and discipline. They will likely remember these times the rest of their lives. They deserve to, and to have our sincere best wishes for the kind of success which only promises greater things to come.

The team consists of: Rebecca Gillette, Joanna Ryan, Amber Potter, Laurel Weiss, Kendra Shufelt, Amber Glave, Tina Owen, Samantha Strough, Bobbie Elwood, Kathy Hoyt, Jessica James, Jennie Lavens, Hilary Matson, Carla Tagliente, Katrina Roe, Darci Contri, Becky Smith, Allisa Altmann, Arlene Hallock, and Coach Karen Funk.

HONORING DR. GIL BELTAN, EDUCATOR

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and a true honor for me to recognize the many achievements of Dr. Gil Beltran who, for over 65 years, has dedicated his life to educating children at his school in Miami. Indeed, Dr. Beltran's unyielding commitment to the education of children is nothing short of remarkable.

He founded his school, La Luz, The Light, with the mission to provide students with the foundations of academic excellence while stressing the importance of serving one's community. The school was first inaugurated at the turn of the century in Havana, Cuba and then initiated again in Miami for the exiled Cuban-American community. Dr. Beltran's determination to educate those who yearned to be free in the United States, and to teach students the true meanings of the words ''liberty'' and ''justice,'' has made him a true philanthropist of the south Florida community. One can measure the resounding success of Dr. Beltran's vision by witnessing the smiles and gratitude of the students and parents on graduation day.

Many Miami residents first learned how to read and write because Dr. Beltran's undying vision and commitment to the youth of south Florida. It should give all a great sense of pride to honor a man whose prescience continues to set a standard of excellence for all to admire.

RINZLER AND LUNTZ ARE RIGHT ON TARGET

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, as the inexcusable Government shutdown drags on, Americans all over the country are justifiably furious that critical services have been halted and that hardworking Federal employees are being forced to work without pay.

In addition, many of our constituents are angry that Members of Congress continue to receive their full pay during this time of crisis. In fact, many of us have cosponsored legislation, as I have, to deny Members their pay during the budget shutdown.

Yesterday, the New York times published an incisive op-ed piece written by two of my constituents, Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz. I commend this timely article to all of my colleagues.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 3, 1996]

CONGRESS SHOULDN'T GET PAID EITHER

(By Carol Ann Rinzler and Perry Luntz)

Almost exactly a year ago, Congress passed the Congressional Accountability Act, a much ballyhooed measure that requires the House and Senate to abide by the workplace and civil rights laws they enact for the rest of us. Alas, like so many things in life, this long-overdue legislation turns out to be less than meets the eye.

In an effort to minimize the effects of the Government shutdown on their constituents, Republicans in the House proposed last week that furloughed Federal employees go back to work without being paid, surely a new idea in free-market, conservative economics.

Afterward, someone asked Representative Tom DeLay of Texas, the House majority whip, whether he would consider giving up his own salary during the crisis. No way, said Mr. DeLay, explaining that, like every other member of Congress, he isn't a Federal employee—he is a ''constitutional officer.''

Well, we've reread our copy of the Constitution, and frankly the distinction seems a bit arcane to us.

True, members of Congress are specifically mentioned in the Constitution Article I, Section 5 says that ''Senators and Representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law and paid out of the Treasury of the United States.'' Cabinet members and Federal judges also get a mention, later on, but other workers—curators at the Smithsonian, say—do not.

But every Federal paycheck originates in an appropriation requiring money from the Treasury, whose funds come, in large part, from income taxes. That should give everyone of us the inalienable right to put in our 2 cents. Or to take it out.

Members of the House and Senate earn a base salary of $133,600 a year (those in leadership positions get more). And don't forget the generous benefit package: life insurance, health insurance, per diem travel and a nifty pension. Mr. DeLay's base salary alone costs each of America's more than 115 million individual taxpayers 1.2 cents a year.

As conscientious citizens, we have always paid our taxes, regardless of our political gripes. Even though one of us was teargassed in 1971 by an overzealous guard at the Nixon White House, protecting it from throngs of balding, middle-aged Vietnam War protesters and their children, the Internal Revenue Service got paid the following year anyway.

This time, however, we plan to draw a line in the sand. Having voted to obey its own laws, members of Congress should be man (or woman) enough to live up to that requirement. Before Tom DeLay votes for trimming Medicare, he should whistle down his own Government-financed health insurance. If he expects Federal workers to show up for free, so should he.

Until then, he can forget our helping to pay his salary. Come April 15, our joint tax return will be 2 cents short. That ought to send a message: keeping Congress in line is a hard job, but somebody has to do it.

100-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF TIGERTON

HON. TOBY ROTH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to wish a happy 100th birthday to the village of Tigerton, WI.

We are not only celebrating a great town—we are also celebrating the people who built a great town.

The people of Tigerton are the kind of Americans about whom Abraham Lincoln said: ''We have been the recipients of the choicest bounties of Heaven.''

Tigerton lies in the heart of Shawano County, a scenic region in northeast Wisconsin known far and wide for its fishing, snowmobiling, golf, swimming, boating, camping, hiking, and biking.

Tigerton's abundant forests are home to abundant deer and small game, which attract legions of hunters.

In fact, Tigerton was settled more than 100 years ago by hard-working people in the timber industry.

The Tigerton Lumber Co., was formed in 1887, and the town of Tigerton was incorporated shortly afterward in 1896.

From that time, the village of Tigerton has grown to its current population of more than 800 citizens.

The village's lumber heritage is preserved by the Tigerton Lumber Co., which is still going strong. Each year, in the last weekend of August, Tigerton Lumberjack Days are held to celebrate the town's main industry.

On Lumberjack Days, the people of Tigerton can get together and enjoy log cutting, sawing, and piling shows, as well as enjoy a corn roast, bingo, rides, music, and bow shooting.

The centennial celebration will culminate during this year's Lumberjack Days, with a parade on August 26.

The opening ceremony will be held at the Tigerton High School gymnasium on January 14. On that day, the Tigerton High School band, and civic figures from the village and the State, with the people of Tigerton to look back on the past 100 years and look forward to the next century.

Indeed, everyone in Tigerton should be very proud of their village's first 100 years.

All of us can look backward on a century of achievements large and small, of four generations of hard-working and God-fearing families.

But this centennial also marks a time to look forward to the future.

The pioneering spirit that inspired the people of Tigerton in its first century lives on today, stronger than ever.

I am confident that the people of Tigerton will make their second century a time of unbounded opportunity and success.

Tigerton and each city and town of our great country and our great State of Wisconsin is unique, but all are bound together in the love of these United States.

As the people of Tigerton commemorate this anniversary, we have a splendid opportunity to renew our commitment to preserve the spirit which has forged America into a land of wonder. I am proud to join you, the people of Tigerton, in making such a commitment on this historic occasion.

Mr. Speaker, with hearty congratulations and best wishes for continued milestones, I salute the village of Tigerton.

HONORING HENRY A. DAWSON

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to pay tribute to an outstanding individual from my district, Mr. Henry A. Dawson. Mr. Dawson will retire this month after 22 years of dedicated service as the executive director of the Springfield Girls Club Family Center.

A native of Rocky Mount, NC, Mr. Dawson enjoyed distinguished military and athletic careers before arriving in Springfield in 1970 to pursue a masters degree at Springfield College and to begin his tenure at the Girls Club Family Center. For the last 22 years Henry Dawson has served as the executive director of the Family Center and has touched the lives of thousands of young people in the Springfield area.

Under Mr. Dawson's direction, the Family Center established many outstanding programs. Among these projects are the Project Extra Plus and Project Extra Plus Preschool, which provided day care with a large variety of recreational activities for school-age and preschool children during nonschool hours. In addition, Mr. Dawson also established the Family Center City Camp which provided day care for 150 children during the summer months, and Camp Mishnoah, a summer resident camp that provided a quality multicultural camping experience for thousands of girls who might otherwise have been denied such an experience.

Mr. Dawson's, ability to create outstanding programs for young people is possibly surpassed only by his ability to raise the funds to keep these programs in operation. Over the years, the Family Center has experienced major funding reductions, and despite this loss, the center's budget has grown and shown an average annual excess of $37,000. This is the result of proven investment practices by Mr. Dawson that have enabled the Family Center to accumulate a respectable endowment and operate deficit free for the pass 22 years. This sound fiscal management will ensure that the Family Center will continue its outstanding work for many years to come.

On behalf of the citizens of the Second Congressional district of Massachusetts, I would like to offer a heartfelt thanks to Henry Dawson for his tireless work with young people and wish him the best as he begins his retirement. His contributions to the youth of Springfield are immeasurable and I am honored to represent such an outstanding individual. People like Henry Dawson are the reason the Boys and Girls Clubs of America have been able to make such a difference in the lives of America's youth for the past century. Thank you Henry and good luck.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THORNDALE HIGH SCHOOL STATE FOOTBALL CHAMPIONS

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the second time in as many years for the same reason, to recognize the Thorndale High School Bulldogs for their State football championship.

I extend my sincere congratulations to head coach Don Cowan and the Bulldogs of Thorndale, TX, who captured the 1995 Class 1A State Championship on December 23, 1995 before a crowd of 8,000 at Gordon Wood Stadium in Brownwood, TX. Defeating the Roscoe Plowboys 14 to 7, the Bulldogs extended their winning streak to 32 games. This feat places Thorndale in a select class with 4 other schools as the only teams in Texas high school football history to post back-to-back 16-win seasons.

The Bulldogs won their second consecutive State championship and third in 6 years with intense defense. Thorndale's defense, stingy all year, held its opponents to single-digit scoring in all but four of its games, six of which were shutouts. The Bulldogs' defense was so tenacious against Roscoe that it forced four interceptions and limited the Plowboys to only nine first downs, two in the second half.

I urge my colleagues to join me today in recognizing and honoring true champions—the players, coaches, students, parents, and citizens of Thorndale, TX.

IN SUPPORT OF ADVANCEMENT OF DEMOCRACY ELSEWHERE

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton once wrote:

> . . . the best strategy to ensure and build a lasting peace is to support the advance of democracy elsewhere.

I concur with this statement, and I add that in order to establish security within our own borders, we must also ensure democracy and security within the borders of the countries close to the United States. Guatemala is one of those countries.

Mr. Speaker, the second round of elections in Guatemala are to be held on January 7, 1996. The people of Guatemala are praying for a legitimate, democratic election. One that will guarantee substantial changes from the past governments and give them hope for true democracy in their own country. If this does not come to pass, then more Guatemalans will come illegally into the United States. At this time, just in Florida alone, there are more than 50,000 Guatemalan immigrants who have come in hopes of finding the American dream of true democracy and justice, something they have been denied for years in their own country. The corruption in Guatemala must stop, and the United States is the only country that has the power to terminate such activity.

Both the President and Congress should make it a priority to see that honest, fraudulent-free elections are held there. As with the elections in Haiti and Nicaragua, the United States should send a cadre of officials to Guatemala to ensure that the voters will not be coerced in any way. The resources that we are currently utilizing to maintain illegals within our country would be better spent tending to the elimination of such corruption, which drives emigres to our soil. Additionally, we should always consider the quality of life for U.S. citizens who reside in these strained countries.

Mr. Speaker, we seek the security of our Nation and we hold dear our own ideals, but too often we disregard the ideals of others living in nations less fortunate, where corruption runs rampant. By taking precautions now, we can lighten the burdens we will have to carry later. I therefore urge President Clinton to order the State Department to monitor the upcoming election in Guatemala, so as to ensure that they are fair and democratic.

IN CELEBRATION OF ELMER AND MARY SIMONIS' 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Elmer and Mary Simonis in celebrating their golden wedding anniversary. For 50 years, Elmer and Mary have demonstrated true devotion and commitment to each other, their family, and their community.

Throughout his career, Elmer's work with the space program led to his involvement in producing the guidance systems for our moon shots. He also spent time assembling the moon buggy. Mary kept busy with the children's Parent-Teacher Association, Brownies, and Girl Scouts. And, she still found time to work as a nurse's aid in a local hospital.

Together they have resided for 21 years on Grove Street in Muskego, WI. Here they raised three lovely daughters, Mary, Donna, and Annette. Growing up, the girls had wonderful role models in parents who were active in various school and church functions. Now, the Simonis' love extends further to their nine beautiful grandchildren.

As we begin 1996, it is with great pleasure that I extend my warmest wishes for a wonderful 50th anniversary and many more happy returns to Elmer and Mary Simonis.

TRIBUTE TO PAT ZICARELLI

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to Pat Zicarelli, who is the outgoing president of the San Fernando Valley Association of Realtors. Under Pat's aggressive leadership, the association expanded membership services, became deeply involved in community affairs, and raised significant funds for the Make-a-Wish Foundation. With his energy and enthusiasm, Pat was an excellent leader for the association. His successor will find him a tough act to follow.

Pat has a 20-year history of participation in civic, community, and business affairs, in the San Fernando Valley. Indeed, his resume is crowded with credits. To cite a few of many examples: Pat is serving a second term as president of the Tarzana Chamber of Commerce, has been an executive business fundraiser for the Muscular Dystrophy Association, has worked with local crime watch programs, and for 2 years was on the board of directors of the Miss California USA Pageant.

Not surprisingly, Pat has been the recipient of numerous awards through the years. In 1982, he was named Realtor-Associate of the Year by the San Fernando Valley Association of Realtors; in 1992 Assemblyman Richard Katz selected Pat to receive the San Fernando Valley Small Business Owner of the Year Award. Pat was also given the Outstanding Person of the Year Award by the Tarzana Chamber of Commerce.

As president of the Valley Association of Realtors, Pat championed the adaptation of new technologies. Always on top of the latest innovations, Pat improved and expanded CRIS–NET, which is widely recognized as one of the industry's most advanced real estate information systems. He has positioned the association to be a key player in the information age.

I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Pat Zicarelli, who has just concluded a successful tenure as president of the San Fernando Valley Association of Realtors. His commitment to business and dedication to his community are an example for us all.

BUDGET IMPASSE DERAILS BENEFITS FOR RAILROAD RETIREES

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, Emperor Nero fiddled while his capital, Rome, burned to the ground.

Now the Imperial Republican-controlled Congress here in Washington would rather keep the Federal Government shut down than do the people's business. Their actions are driving Federal workers and Federal contractors to the brink of financial disaster.

Besides the Federal workers and Federal suppliers, there are other victims of the Federal shutdown: the retired railroad workers and their families.

While Speaker GINGRICH and other House Republicans rang in the New Year by celebrating with friends and family more than 170,000 railroad retirees had their monthly pension checks severely cut.

Had the Republican leadership done its job on time, these railroad retirees would be receiving their vested dual benefits checks that average $130 per month. That means that more than 13,000 beneficiaries in Pennsylvania and others across the Nation will receive only partial annuity checks.

For some railroad retirees their Medicare part B premiums will consume their entire benefit checks. The bill that contains the funding for these railroad retirees has not even been brought to the Senate floor.

To add insult to injury, Speaker GINGRICH has announced his intentions to recess the House until January 23. This makes no sense.

Railroad retirees spent their entire careers keeping our trains operating on time. This is no time to forget railroad retirees and their families. Keep the Congress at work and restore full benefits to these railroad retirees.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BROWNFIELDS REDEVELOPMENT ACT

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, environmental cleanup and economic redevelopment of old, abandoned industrial sites is a critical issue for cities across America. These unproductive, often polluted sites are called brownfields.

There are over 400,000 brownfield sites scattered across the United States. Over the last decades, these brownfield sites have become not only public health and pollution problems, but also serious impediments to the economic health of the surrounding communities. Because the risk of assuming financial liability for a brownfield site is so great, potential purchasers and lenders have shied away from redevelopment of such properties. The result has been the loss of job opportunities and tax revenue in many communities, blighted neighborhoods, and the expensive, unnecessary, and wasteful construction of infrastructure like roads and sewers at new ''greenfield'' sites in nearby communities.

Affordable financing is one of the major stumbling blocks in the cleanup and reuse of brownfield sites. The Brownfields Redevelopment Act, which I am introducing today, seeks to address and ease the financial impediments to brownfield redevelopment through two separate provisions. First, the Brownfields Redevelopment Act would create a substantial tax incentive for private sector brownfield cleanups. In many cases, companies which are in the process of building new facilities might prefer to build these facilities on brownfield sites, where the necessary public infrastructure—roads and sewers, for example—is already in place and where a ready supply of prospective employees live nearby. However, the cost of environmental remediation and the risk of future financial liability has too often caused companies to shy away from such otherwise desirable locations. Cleaning up hazardous waste sites is an expensive, risky, and often time-consuming process. To provide an incentive for brownfield cleanup and redevelopment, the Brownfields Redevelopment Act would create a tax credit for private sector environmental remediation.

Specifically, this bill would provide a 50-percent tax credit for environmental remediation expenses incurred in completing a cleanup plan approved by the EPA or a designated State agency. In order to target this tax credit at the most potentially productive sites, the tax credit would be restricted to those sites that meet the following four criteria: the site has had no productive use for at least 1 year; the site would be unlikely to undergo redevelopment without tax credit assistance; the site has a strong likelihood of creating jobs and expanding the tax base after redevelopment; and the planned environmental remediation and redevelopment would be completed in a reasonably short period of time. The tax credit would also be available only to ''innocent owners'' of polluted property. It is my hope that such a tax credit will stimulate increased brownfield cleanup and redevelopment all across the country.

If this credit is successful in encouraging brownfield cleanup and redevelopment, it will bring jobs and revitalization to thousands of communities across the country. I believe that the benefits such redevelopment would provide by revitalizing our central cities would far outweigh the cost of the credit. Moreover, the costs of allowing these sites to remain vacant and contaminated are—while less obvious—quite substantial.

The second provision of the Brownfield Redevelopment Act would modify the Internal Revenue Code's existing qualified redevelopment bond [QRB] provisions to specify that environmental remediation was an allowable use of such bonds. The interest paid on qualified redevelopment bonds—bonds which are used for financing redevelopment in designated blighted areas—is tax-exempt. As a result, municipalities that issue such bonds can pay lower interest rates when they borrow money for redevelopment projects. In effect, the Federal Government subsidizes local governments' redevelopment activities through this Tax Code provision. Although brownfield sites are clearly blighted areas, environmental remediation is not specifically identified in the Tax Code as an allowable use of qualified redevelopment Bond proceeds. To address this oversight, the Brownfields Redevelopment Act would add environmental remediation to the list of activities that qualify for the use of the proceeds from the sale of qualified redevelopment bonds. This change would allow local governments to borrow money for brownfield cleanup at slightly less than market rates.

The bill would also waive a number of existing QRB restrictions when the bonds were issued for environmental remediation activities. Most importantly, the Brownfields Redevelopment Act would waive a section of the current law that requires that designated blighted areas be at least 100 acres in size. The great majority of brownfield sites desperately in need of redevelopment are much smaller than 100 acres. Many, in fact, are only a few acres. Consequently, this and similar requirements would be modified under the Brownfields Redevelopment Act to address the special conditions that are often associated with brownfield sites.

The QRB provisions of the Brownfield Redevelopment Act would be nearly revenue-neutral. While thousands of brownfield sites would be eligible for redevelopment using tax-exempt

QRB's, the volume of qualified redevelopment bonds issued would be constrained by the existing State bond volume caps established under section 146 of the Internal Revenue Code. Local governments wishing to issue qualified redevelopment bonds for brownfield sites would have to compete with other issuers for authority to issue private activity bonds under the State volume cap.

Mr. Speaker, vacant, polluted brownfield sites have become a serious problem for our country. They have blighted many of our communities in both financial and environmental terms, and they have contributed to urban sprawl. Restoring and redeveloping our country's brownfield sites will be a difficult task—it will take the cooperation of both the public and private sectors. The financial assistance provided in this bill would be a valuable tool in the environmental and economic redevelopment of America. I urge my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''present'' on rollcall No. 1; ''no'' on rollcall No. 2; ''yes'' on rollcall No. 3; and ''no'' on rollcall No. 4.

BOSNIA AND THE FUTURE OF NATO

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, the new Secretary General of NATO, Javier Solana, wrote a piece in the Washington Post on December 24, 1995, entitled ''In Bosnia, a Defining Moment.'' I was impressed with his analysis, particularly concerning the cooperation of 16 non-NATO nations with the 16 Members of NATO in support of the Bosnia Implementation Force. As the Secretary General states ''[W]e have the opportunity not only to end the war in Bosnia but to lay the foundations for an enduring structure of peace across a now-undivided and democratic Europe.''

I comment the article to the attention of my colleagues. The text follows:

[From the Washington Post; Dec. 24, 1995]

(By Javier Solana)

IN BOSNIA, A DEFINING MOMENT

Much of the debate that preceded last week's deployment of a NATO-led peace implementation force into Bosnia centered on whether the stakes involved justified sending the young men and women of this alliance into harm's way. On this point, the response of our 16 member nations has been clear: We simply had to act in order to bring the worst conflict in Europe since World War II to a definitive halt.

The alternative would not only have been to condemn the people of Bosnia to further suffering but to risk seeing the conflict spread and perhaps confront us with the need to intervene in a shooting war on a much larger scale. Because NATO nations on both sides of the Atlantic remember all too well the price paid in 1914 and 1939 because of Western blunders and blindness, they were determined not to miss this opportunity to stop a war in the heart of Europe when it was in their power to do so.

What has received less attention in the international Force (IFOR) debate are the profound implications for NATO of this operation, which is the first ground force ''out-of-area'' deployment in our 46-year history. For those who until recently considered the organization a Cold War relic, the coalition that our supreme allied commander Europe, Gen. George A. Joulwan, is assembling must seem astonishing indeed.

Thus far, 16 non-NATO nations have joined the 16 allies in ''Operation Joint Endeavor.'' These include many of our former adversaries from Central and Eastern Europe who now wish to join NATO, neutral countries such as Sweden and Finland, non-European nations such as Egypt and Pakistan and, most notably, Russia. Still other nations, such as Austria and Switzerland, have broken with tradition and taboo to cooperate with NATO to facilitate the largest and most complex movement of forces by land, sea and air in Europe in 50 years.

Clearly, something is happening in Europe today that transcends the Bosnian situation. Underlying the desire of so many nations to contribute to this NATO-led operation is a consciousness that a defining moment in the post-Cold War security order has arrived. This is not a moment or an opportunity that has come about by accident. NATO has worked quietly but intensively over the past two years to prepare the new democracies in our Partnership for Peace program for such joint operations, just as we have endeavored to build a truly cooperative relationship with the Russian Federation.

Thus in Bosnia we have an opportunity not only to end a war in the Balkans but to lay the foundations for an enduring structure of peace across a now-undivided and democratic Europe.

I am keenly aware that it is one thing to proclaim such a lofty ideal and quite another for our troops to face the grim reality of a Balkan winter under trying and dangerous circumstances. Throughout history, it has been ever thus—it has been to the lonely foot soldier to realize the visions of leaders and politicians.

But thanks to their capacity to learn from the mistakes of the first half of this century, two generations of Europeans and North Americans have not had to ask their sons and daughters to sacrifice themselves in another world war. They have not had to do so—and current and future generations will not have to do so—largely because NATO exists to keep the peace.

Now that a new NATO is moving boldly to meet the post-Cold War security challenges of a new Europe, our thoughts should go to our young soldiers of peace who will spend their Christmas truly spreading the season's message of hope to their fellow man.

H.R. 2843, VETERANS' INSURANCE REFORM ACT OF 1995

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which will update and make changes to two of the VA insurance programs—the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance [SGI] and the Veterans' Group Life Insurance [VGLI]. My distinguished colleagues, SONNY MONTGOMERY, TERRY EVERETT, LANE EVANS, and CHRIS SMITH, join me in introducing this bill.

The SGLI Program provides group life insurance coverage to persons on active duty in the military service, Ready Reservists, members of the uniformed services, cadets and midshipmen of the four service academies and members of the Reserve Office Training Corps. Although it is a program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, this program is actually administered by the Prudential Insurance Co.

The VGLI Program is a program of post-separation insurance which provides for the conversion of servicemen's group life insurance to a 5-year term policy. Like Servicemen's Group, Veterans' Group is supervised by the Department of Veterans Affairs but administered by the Office of Servicemen's Group Life Insurance.

This bill would make quite a few changes, including setting the automatic coverage under SGLI at $200,000 from the current $100,000; allowing the Secretary the authority to terminate an individual's insurance if premiums are not paid within 60 days; and renaming the Servicemen's Group Life Insurance Program to Servicemember's Group Life Insurance.

Additional provisions include merging the Retired Reserve Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance and Veterans' Group Life Insurance Programs; extending VGLI lifetime coverage to members of the Ready Reserve of a uniformed service; providing for an individual, upon separation from the military, to change to the SGLI Program or choose as commercial policy; and eliminating the 5-year VGLI renewal period.

Mr. Speaker, we already know that these are great insurance programs and are very popular with veterans and active duty personnel. The changes offered in this legislation will improve the programs for current policy holders and future participants.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

A CHAMPION OF ECONOMIC JUSTICE

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to former Seattle Councilman Sam Smith who passed away November 16, 1995. Sam Smith was born July 21, 1922, on a farm just outside of Gibsland, LA. He entered the U.S. Army in 1942, was assigned to a post in Seattle, and achieved the rank of warrant officer. After World War II, he married his high school sweetheart, Marion, and together they raised six children. Sam earned a degree in social science from Seattle University in 1951, and a degree in economics from the University of Washington in 1952. He entered politics in 1956, and was elected to the Washington State Legislature in 1958, representing the 37th Legislative District of Washington for five terms until 1967. Sam then was elected to the Seattle City Council. He was the

council's first black member, and he served on the council for 24 years.

What made Sam Smith one of the finest elected officials to hold office in Seattle? Was it his insistence that he answer his own telephone with the familiar and friendly, ''This is Sam''? Or his warm smile and greeting of ''Hi, neighbor'' to all he encountered on his regular strolls through the neighborhoods of Seattle? Was it his keen political skills that found answers to problems when others could not? Or was it his unique ability to bring opposing sides together to find common ground?

Yes, Sam Smith will be remembered for the way he answered his phone, greeted people on the streets, found answers and not excuses. However, he also is remembered as a champion of economic justice. Sam Smith addressed issues in a direct, thoughtful, and dedicated manner, at a time in our country's history when talk of fair housing and fair employment opportunities for minorities and the working poor too often was met with ignorance and indifference. He is remembered as someone who lifted as he climbed. Sam Smith was among the fathers of the robust diversity that distinguishes Seattle politics nationally. Many city, county, and State public officials attribute their opportunities to Sam and the avenues he opened for them.

Mr. Speaker, the city of Seattle mourns the loss of Sam Smith, someone who dedicated his life to public service, who greeted one and all with warmth and respect, and who, above all, cared about his neighbors.

IN HONOR OF COL. BILLY CLYDE STEED

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to recognize a fellow Mississippian, Col. Billy Clyde Steed, who is retiring this month after 40 years of service in the U.S. Marine Corps. I wanted to share with my colleagues the highlights of Colonel Steed's outstanding career of service to his country.

He enlisted in the Marine Corps in January 1956. After completion of recruit training, he reported to the 2d Marine Division and was assigned to the 8th Marine Regiment. He was later assigned to the amphibious reconnaissance company.

In 1958, he was ordered to Marine Barracks, 8th & I, and remained there until 1962. From 1962 to 1964, he was stationed at the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, as a drill instructor. Colonel Steed was then transferred to the 1st Marine Division and served with 3d Battalion, 7th Marines. The 3d Battalion, 7th Marines, deployed to Okinawa and was redesignated as 1st Battalion, 3d Marines, and deployed to Vietnam in January 1965. During this period, he served as a squad leader, platoon sergeant, and platoon commander.

Returning to the United States in 1965, he was again assigned to Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego, as an instructor at the Drill Instructor School.

Commissioned a second lieutenant on September 30, 1966, he was ordered to the 2d Marine Division and attended the Aerial Observer School. During his tour with the 2d Marine Division he served as an instructor at the Aerial Observer School, executive officer for L Company, 3d Battalion, 6th Marines, and commanding officer, Headquarters Company, Headquarters Battalion, 2d Marine Division. On December 30, 1967, he was promoted to 1st lieutenant. In 1968, he joined the 3d Battalion, 27th Marines, and deployed to the Republic of Vietnam, serving as a platoon commander, executive officer, and later as commander, I Company.

When the 27th Marines returned to the United States, he remained in Vietnam and was assigned to the 1st Marine Division Aerial Observer Section. Upon returning to the United States in 1969, he was assigned to the G–4, Camp Pendleton, CA.

In March 1970, he was promoted to Captain. From 1970 to 1971, he served with the Shore Party Battalion, 5th Marine Division, as a company commander and operations officer.

Graduating from the Amphibious Warfare School in 1971, he was assigned as a company commander at Officer Candidate School.

Again ordered to the Republic of Vietnam in December 1972, he served as an aerial observer with Air Naval Gunfire Liaison Company. Following the cease fire, he transferred to the Landing Support Group, 3d Force Service Regiment, Nam Phong, Thailand, and served as the operations officer.

In 1974, he returned to the United States and was assigned as the I–I, E Company, 2d Battalion, 23d Marines, Concord, CA.

He was promoted to major in June 1977. He was next ordered to the 1st Marine Brigade in Hawaii and served as Weapons Company Commander, the executive officer for 2d Battalion, 3d Marines, the regimental S–4, and the operations officer for the 31st Marine Amphibious Unit.

Graduating from the Armed Forces Staff College in 1981, he was assigned as the Chief Aerial Observer, VMO–2, Camp Pendleton, CA. In July 1982, he was promoted to lieutenant colonel and assigned to the air-ground exchange program where he served as G–3 Plans and Deputy G–4, 3d Marine Aircraft Wing.

In 1984 he was assigned to the 1st Marines as the regimental executive officer. During April 1985, Colonel Steed assumed command of the 1st Battalion, 9th Marines. In 1987 he was assigned as Assistant Chief of Staff, G–7, for preparedness and Special Operations Training Group of I Marine Expeditionary Force until August 1988. On August 29, 1988, Colonel Steed assumed command of the 25th Marines. On October 1, 1988, he was promoted to Colonel.

On December 15, 1990, Colonel Steed was assigned as the MARCENT/I MEF G–3 (Operations Officer) during Desert Shield/Desert Storm. During that operation, Colonel Steed served as the operations officer for the largest U.S. Marine Corps combat operation since the Vietnam conflict.

Returning to the United States in April 1991, Colonel Steed served as the G–3 Operations Officer for I MEF during the largest employment of U.S. Marine Corps Forces in counterdrug interdiction efforts in history. He was responsible for the deployment of over 10,000 marines and sailors in support of Joint Task Force-6 over a 2-year period. He later assumed the duties as Chief of Staff for I MEF, where he deployed to Somalia in November 1992. He later served as the Special Military Assistant to Adm. Jonathan Howe, USN (Retired), the Special U.S. Representative to Humanitarian and United Nations Operations in that besieged country. Following his return to the United States, he was summoned back to Somalia to work with the United Nations.

Colonel Steed is currently the director of expeditionary warfare and special operations training at the Naval Amphibious Base, Coronado, CA.

Colonel Steed's personal decorations include: the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with Combat ''V,'' the Air Medal (Individual Award), 17 Strike Flight Awards with Combat ''V,'' the Navy Commendation Medal with Combat ''V'' with two gold stars and the Purple Heart with on gold star.

THE OBSERVER ANNUAL AWARD DINNER

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a number of Pittsburgh groups and residents who will be honored next week at the annual dinner hosted by the Observer newspaper.

Each year the Observer presents a number of awards for outstanding community service. It also selects an individual for its Humanitarian Service Award, and it confers Man and Woman of the Year Awards. I would like to recognize this year's award recipients here today.

The recipients of the Awards for Outstanding Service are listed below:

Mr. Arnold Horovitz, Esq. and Kenneth Stiles, Esq., who are being honored for their efforts to enforce zoning code provisions in a number of city neighborhoods.

The Elliott-West Athletic Association, which is being honored for 30 years of service to young people in Pittsburgh's West End, and for a number of other public service efforts, including its efforts to maintain Herschel Field.

The Pittsburgh Habitat for Humanity, which is being honored for its volunteers' efforts to provide affordable housing for low-income residents of the city of Pittsburgh.

The Hill District Community Development Corporation, which is being honored for its work in creating the Crawford Square housing development—a successful mixed income, mixed use market rate urban residential community.

The Lambda Foundation and the Pittsburgh Tavern Guild, which are being jointly honored for their philanthropic activities benefiting organizations and agencies that provide social, educational, and health-related services to members of Pittsburgh's gay and lesbian community.

The Lawrenceville Development Corp., which is being honored for its work to revitalize the historic Doughboy Square are of Lawrenceville, and for the construction and successful marketing of the Doughboy Square Townhomes—the largest new-construction housing development undertaken in Lawrenceville in the past 30 years.

The Manchester Citizens Corp., which is being honored for its continuing work to revitalize Manchester, its youth employment programs, and for the creation of a comprehensive neighborhood revitalization plan that resulted in a successful application for a HUD HOPE VI grant.

Mr. Nate Geller, of Highland Park, who is being honored for his long-term commitment to Pittsburgh's young people through his efforts as a volunteer baseball coach, basketball coach, and soccer coach, and for his volunteer work for the Sister Cities organizations as an organizer of the 1995 visit here by the Russian Junior Olympic Baseball Team.

The Northside Leadership Conference and the Spring Garden Neighborhood Council, which are being honored jointly for successfully developing and marketing the Vosscamp Villas townhomes on Vosscamp Street in Spring Garden.

The Overbrook Community Council and the West End-Elliott Joint Project, which are being honored jointly for their efforts to secure government action on a comprehensive flood control project along Saw Mill Run, a stream in Pittsburgh's southern and western neighborhoods.

The Pittsburgh Downtown Partnership, which is being honored for its volunteer effort to enhance the image of the downtown Pittsburgh business district through beautification and clean-up projects, public safety advocacy, retail management seminars, and marketing and promotional activities—including Sparkle Season, a successful Christmas shopping marketing program designed to attract shoppers back to the downtown business district.

Pittsburgh Cares, which is being honored for its efforts to recruit and coordinate volunteers, including corporately sponsored groups, for numerous and wide-ranging community service projects benefiting individuals, nonprofit organizations, and neighborhoods throughout the city of Pittsburgh.

The Overbrook Teen Council, which is being honored for its many community service efforts, including service to senior citizens, young people, and the community at large, and for its efforts in support of a comprehensive flood control project along Saw Mill Run.

Preservation Pittsburgh, which is being honored for the second year in a row for its efforts to preserve—and encourage the restoration of—important buildings and landmarks in the city. Its most notable projects this year consisted of the Mary Schenley and Westinghouse fountains in Oakland's Schenley Park.

Mr. Randy Gilson, a resident of the Mexican War Streets, for his leadership in beautification efforts on Pittsburgh's Northside, including the creation of more than 40 community gardens and parklets, largely at his own expense.

The South Side Local Development Co., which is being honored for its successful 10-year effort to revitalize the Carson Street shopping district, its community planning and housing development efforts, and for its advocacy efforts on behalf of Monongahela riverfront development and enforcement of local zoning ordinances.

The Squirrel Hill Urban Coalition, which is being honored for its role in creating the Squirrel Hill Citizens Patrol, an all-volunteer public safety organization that patrols neighborhood streets and reports illegal and suspicious activity to local police authorities.

This year, the Observer's Humanitarian Award goes to Mr. Stanley Frankowski, who is being honored for his fundraising activities on behalf of people in need of organ transplants, and for undertaking a public relations and legal campaign that convinced a major health maintenance organization to agree to pay for a liver transplant that they had previously denied, thus extending and probably saving the life of one of his employees.

The Observer has chosen Mr. Randy Gilson as this year's Man of the Year. Mr. Gilson was chosen because of his strong leadership and his commitment to public service, and because he provides an excellent role model for other city residents—and, in particular, for young people living in Northside neighborhoods.

The Observer has chosen Ms. Rebecca White as its Woman of the Year. Ms. White is being honored for providing retail consulting services to neighborhoods and organizations in the city of Pittsburgh, as well as for working diligently as a volunteer with numerous community and business groups. She is also being honored for her contributions to the renovation and rehabilitation of Lawrenceville business district in the years since 1988.

Finally, I also want to commend Michael Romanello and the Observer newspaper for organizing this dinner to recognize those individuals and organizations who embody the spirit of Pittsburgh in their service to their community. I also want to thank the paper for the high-quality service that it has provided to many of Pittsburgh's communities. The Observer provides many neighborhoods with timely information on important local affairs and issues. This paper has helped to bring many of our communities together and to give voice to their concerns.

All of these individuals and organizations have made significant contributions to the people and communities of Pittsburgh. Without generous volunteers like these, the qualify of life in our city would be much lower. They deserve our thanks and commendation. I salute their selfless service.

MONSIGNOR HARRY J. BYRNE, J.C.D. ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS PRIESTLY ORDINATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the achievements of Msgr. Harry J. Byrne, pastor of Epiphany Parish, on this happy occasion—the 50th anniversary of his priestly ordination. Monsignor Byrne has played an extraordinary role in my community, both in civic and in spiritual matters.

The Monsignor entered St. Joseph's Seminary in 1940, was ordained on December 1, 1945, and later went on to complete a doctoral degree in Canon Law at the Catholic University of America, in our Nation's capital.

After holding varied positions with the Archdiocesan Chancery, Monsignor Byrne was appointed Chancellor in 1968. Through his work with the Archdioces, he was part of an enormously successful project under which $300 million low and moderate income housing units were constructed.

Later, as a public appointee of Mayor Edward I. Koch to the Rent Guidelines Board, he was actively involved in a host of issues concerning affordable housing and housing rights.

Many New Yorkers are indebted to Monsignor Byrne for his tireless efforts on behalf of tenants who undoubtedly gained because of his fair and just voice on the Rent Guidelines Board.

In 1982, Monsignor Byrne was appointed pastor of Epiphany Parish, where his dedication and devotion have earned him the praise of all who have had the good fortune to work with him. During his tenure at Epiphany Parish, Monsignor Byrne has been a creative and innovative leader. Among the important changes he has initiated are the early introduction of altar girls, the establishment of a restricted endowment fund, and the expansion of the Epiphany School. The Monsignor's efforts do not stop at the church doors. He volunteers in the community as well, serving as vice president of the local Ronald McDonald House.

Monsignor Byrne is a very special friend of mine who has given a great deal to his community through his work in religious realm as well as his involvement in housing issues and other volunteer activities.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Monsignor Byrne on his extraordinary achievements and in wishing him well in his next 50 years of service to God and to his community.

A STAMP TO HONOR GOV. GEORGE CLINTON

HON. MAURICE D. HINCHEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, a renewed effort is underway in New York State urging the U.S. Postal Service to issue a postage stamp in memory of U.S. Vice President and Governor of New York, George Clinton.

George Clinton was the ''George Washington'' of New York. The State's first Governor, he had a pivotal role in the transition of New York to a State from a colony. As a patriot, citizen-soldier, and military strategist, he helped write an important chapter in the American way for independence.

Few realize today that George Clinton was a monumental public figure and statesman who went on to serve terms as Vice President under Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. He is the only Vice President in U.S. history to serve in that position under two separate administrations.

The Militia Association of New York, a defense advocacy group representing over 2,000 New York Army and Air National Guard and State militia component officers, and many other New Yorkers, are asking the U.S. Postal Service to issue the stamp on July 26, 1999, on the occasion of the 260th birthday of Governor Clinton. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and fellow citizens to join us in this worthwhile effort.

NOTING THE PASSING OF MRS. RUBIE J. McCULLOUGH

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I announce the passing of Mrs. Rubie Jones McCullough on December 27, 1995. I joined members of the McCullough family, Rubie's many friends, and members of the Greater Cleveland community, in celebrating the life of Rubie McCullough at homegoing services on January 2, 1996. The passing of this dedicated individual brings to a close a life committed to serving others. I rise in order to share with my colleagues some information regarding this distinguished individual.

Rubie was born in Enfield, NC, on July 16, 1918, to the late Arthur and Corrina Jones. She received her education in North Carolina, including a degree in teaching business administration from North Carolina Central University. Early in her career, she taught school in North Carolina. Rubie McCullough came to Cleveland in 1945, where she began a 23-year association with the Phillis Wheatley Association. The organization benefited from her strong leadership and commitment to serving others. It was also during this period that Rubie met and married her loving partner and companion, William (Ted) McCullough.

Mr. Speaker, in 1968, Rubie McCullough undertook one of her greatest challenges. In response to the community's need for youth services, including tutoring and counseling programs, she founded the Harvard Community Services Center. Over the years, with the support of the business and civic community, the center expanded to include senior services and programs to assist families. Mrs. McCullough served as executive director of the Harvard Community Services Center from its inception until her retirement in 1989. Rubie McCullough also maintained her strong commitment to education. Cuyahoga Community College prospered under her leadership of the board of trustees for 21 years. She approached the assignment with the highest level of commitment and dedication.

During her lifetime, Rubie J. McCullough earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues and others throughout the community. She was a social activist whose stature rests upon a lifetime of commitment to service, social justice, equality and opportunity for all people. Rubie was the recipient of numerous awards and honors which recognized her commitment and dedication to service.

Mr. Speaker, her obituary stated that Rubie McCullough was, ''a wife, mother, grandmother, sister and friend, whose life mirrored service, commitment and dedication to God and mankind.'' These words describe an individual who was a close friend and supporter. Those of us who were the beneficiaries of her unselfish devotion will miss our colleague and confidant. She was a woman of intellect and dignity, and she was very special to all who knew her.

I take this opportunity to express my sympathy to Rubie's loving husband of 47 years, William (Ted) McCullough, her son William C. McCullough, Jr., and her daughter-in-law, Carolyne. I also extend deepest sympathy to Rubie's sister, Lucinda Jones Smith, her brother, Charles Jones, and her grandchildren; William C. III, David, Stacey, and Morgan McCullough. She also leaves to mourn a number of nieces and nephews, many other relatives and a host of loving friends. God has called Rubie McCullough home to rest, but she will always be in our hearts.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 4, PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY AND WORK OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. PETER G. TORKILDSEN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, December 21, 1995

Mr. TORKILDSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to strongly support this compromise legislation. I voted against the original House-passed welfare package, and received a fair amount of criticism for it. But that original package needed to be changed, especially in two key areas.

The original bill attempted to turn child nutrition programs, such as school lunch and WIC, into block grants. Additionally, it completely eliminated the social safety net for legal immigrants.

The Senate-House compromise bill addresses these concerns in this final bill. Specifically, the nutrition block-grant proposal has been eliminated: WIC will continue to be a separately funded program, one that works well in providing early childhood nutrition and education for both children and their parents.

The compromise bill will also continue to allow legal immigrants to receive benefits that their tax dollars pay for. While States will have to agree, the language in the compromise bill is a substantial improvement over the original language.

This welfare reform bill also includes the strongest child support enforcement provisions ever enacted by the Federal Government.

Child support checks often mean the difference between self-sufficiency and dependency on welfare. With this bill, we are sending a clear message that it is never acceptable to abandon your children, and if you do, the penalties will be severe.

I am proud to have sponsored a provision in this bill that will prevent parents from hiding assets in other States, while neglecting to pay the child support payments they are legally, and morally, required to make. My provision will allow a custodial parent to place a lien on a delinquent parent's asset, without having to travel from State to State. In this provision, property liens will be given ''full faith and credit'' in every State, forcing parents to meet their moral and financial responsibilities.

The Personal Responsibility Act gives States and localities the necessary flexibility to implement innovative approaches to serving those in need. States will have the option to choose from a number of policy suggestions set forth in this bill, including requiring mothers under 18 to attend school and live with an adult, and denying additional cash benefits to those mothers who have children while receiving benefits. The Governor of my home State, Bill Weld, has a bold welfare reform plan which cannot be fully implemented, until this bill becomes law.

This bill represents the end of welfare as we know it. People trapped in the current system will be given encouragement and assistance in obtaining jobs and education. It will prevent abuse of the welfare system, by placing a lifetime limit on benefits. Welfare was never meant to be a way of life. This bill returns welfare to the short-term assistance plan it was always meant to be.

I urge the President to fulfill his campaign pledge to ''end welfare as we know it'' by signing this bill. Without these reforms, the cycle of poverty that has afflicted so many for the past three decades will only continue. This compromise is a win for children, a win for those trapped in a failed system, and a win for taxpayers.

CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT OF 1995

HON. J.D. HAYWORTH

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 4, 1996

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2727, the Congressional Responsibility Act of 1955.

The Congressional Responsibility Act corrects a serious violation of the Constitution: Article I, section 1 states that ''All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress.'' The section, moreover, makes clear that this legislative power includes the power to regulate. Congress, however, routinely delegates this authority to unelected bureaucrats. The Congressional Responsibility Act will stop delegation by requiring Congress to approve Federal regulations.

Americans are disillusioned with Government. They believe, in particular, that Congress, designed to be the most accountable branch of Government, has grown increasingly unresponsive and unaccountable.

As usual, the American people are correct. Government is less accountable than it was the first 150 years of the Republic. Beginning in the late 1930's, the Federal Government retreated from the fundamental constitutional principle that vests lawmaking power solely with the people's elected representatives.

An elemental principle of representative government is political accountability: The public's right to hold elected officials responsible for the laws imposed upon them. This is especially important today, as government has assumed an increasingly larger role in the lives of Americans. But good government suffers, liberty diminishes, and bad laws proliferate when the link between voter and elected official is severed.

The Framers of our Constitution understood this danger and wisely followed John Locke's admonition that ''the legislative cannot transfer the power of making law to any other hands.''

In practice, however, Congress routinely delegates its lawmaking duties to politically unaccountable bureaucrats who craft regulations with the full force of law. From clean air to savings and loans, past Congresses have ceded responsibility for lawmaking to bureaucratic fiat. Delegation gives life to bad laws. Such laws would not stand a chance in bright, open sunshine, but they can slip by in the dark, without widespread support or deliberation.

For example, in 1972, the Clean Water Act granted the Corps of Engineers authority to

regulate areas adjacent to, or connected to, navigable waters. Over time, however, Federal regulations have been extended to include even isolated wetlands with no connection to navigable waterways. This is clearly a case of regulations going far beyond the scope of statutory language; in fact, the word ''wetlands'' does not appear in the 1972 Clean Water Act.

This law, which was originally created to prohibit the discharge of pollutants into water. It was used, however, used to prosecute John Pozsgai of Morrisville, PA. Pozsgai cleaned up a 14-acre dump site he purchased to expand his truck repair business. Although Federal regulators may have been happy to see the junk hauled away, when Pozsgai leveled about 5 acres with clean fill dirt, the EPA took him to court because it said the dump he cleaned up was really a valuable wetland. He was fined $5,000 and sentenced to 3 years in jail. Pozsgai's only crime: dumping dirt without permission.

Delegation also permits Congress to grant favors without imposing costs and to exercise selective power without taking responsibility for its consequences. Like budget deficits, Congress is able to reap the benefits of its largess, but avoid blame for its costs. Moreover, delegation allows powerful special interests to expand substantial resources in private to benefit the few at the expense of the many. With delegation, Congress can be everything to all people, but, ultimately, it is the people who lose.

The Congressional Responsibility Act corrects these abuses by requiring agency regulations to be presented to Congress for a vote, either under expedited procedures or through the normal legislative process. The bill provides that Federal regulations will not take effect unless passed by a majority of Representatives and Senators and signed by the President—or a veto is overridden. This concept was offered by Justice Stephen Breyer—before his appointment to the Supreme Court—as a method to satisfy ''* * * the literal wording of the Constitution's bicameral and presentation clauses * * *''

This reform is ideologically neutral and nonpartisan. Concerns about delegation have been voiced by people from across the political spectrum, including Judge Robert Bork and ACLU president, Nadine Strossen. I hope that my colleagues who are committed to restoring the public's right to hold its elected officials responsible for their actions will support this important legislation.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate agreed to further continuing appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S35–S72

Measures Introduced: One resolution was introduced, as follows: S.J. Res. 46. **Page S66**

Measures Passed:

Further Continuing Appropriations: Senate passed H.J. Res. 153, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 1996, clearing the measure for the President. **Page S36**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Stuart E. Eizenstat, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade. **Page S72**

Messages From the House: **Page S66**

Communications: **Page S66**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S66–67**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S67**

Additional Statements: **Pages S67–71**

Recess: Senate convened at 11 a.m., and recessed at 5:54 p.m., until 11 a.m., on Friday, January 5, 1996. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on pages S71–72.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 9 public bills, H.R. 2842–2850; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 156 and H. Res. 331–333 were introduced. **Page H187**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 2130, to amend the Farm Credit Act of 1971 to improve the efficiency and operation of the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation in order better to ensure that farmers, ranchers and rural home owners will have access to a stable and competitive supply of mortgage credit now and in the future, amended (H. Rept. 104–446, Part I); and

H. Res. 334, providing for consideration of a motion to dispose of the Senate amendment to H.R. 1643, to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria (H. Rept. 104–447). **Pages H185–86**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designates Representative LaHood to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H93**

Interior Appropriations: By a yea-and-nay vote of 239 yeas to 177 nays, Roll No. 5, the House sustained the President's veto of H.R. 1977, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996 (two-thirds of those present not voting to override. Subsequently, the message and the bill were referred to the Committee on Appropriations). **Pages H111–20**

Earlier, agreed to the Regula motion to discharge the Committee on Appropriations from further consideration of the veto of the bill by a voice vote. **Pages H98–H111**

Recess: House recessed at 11:16 p.m. and reconvened at 11:40 p.m.

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H111.

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on page H120. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: Met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 11:41 p.m.

Committee Meetings

ENERGY DEPARTMENT TRAVEL EXPENDITURES

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on the Department of Energy: Travel Expenditures and Related Issues. Testimony was heard from Victor Rezendes, Director, Energy Issues, GAO.

HAITI

Committee on International Relations: Held a hearing on Haiti: Human Rights and Police Issues. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of State: Robert S. Gelbard, Assistant Secretary, International Narcotics and Legal Affairs; and James Dobbins, Special Coordinator for Haiti; and the following officials of the Department of Justice: Bill Perry, Deputy Assistant Director, Criminal Investigative Division, FBI; and Seth Waxman, Associate Deputy Attorney General.

MFN STATUS FOR BULGARIA

Committee on Rules: Granted a rule providing that it will be in order to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 1643, to authorize the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment (most-favored-nation treatment) to the products of Bulgaria, with the Senate amendment, and consider in the House the motion printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the rule. The rule provides that the Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The rule waives all points of order against the motion. The rule provides one hour of general debate on the motion, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The rule provides that the previous question is considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion or demand for a division of the question. Testimony was heard from Representative Jackson-Lee.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, JANUARY 5, 1996

Senate

No committee meetings are scheduled.

House

No committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Friday, January 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Friday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12 Noon), Senate may consider conference reports, if available, and any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Friday, January 5

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of the President's veto of H.R. 2099, VA, HUD Appropriations for fiscal year 1996; and

Consideration, if available, of the President's veto of H.R. 4, Personal Responsibility Act of 1995.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E17
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E16
Collins, Cardiss, Ill., E13
Coyne, William J., Pa., E13, E16, E18
Edwards, Chet, Tex., E15
Hamilton, Lee H., Ind., E17
Hayworth, J.D., Ariz., E20
Hinchey, Maurice D., N.Y., E19
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wis., E15
Klink, Ron, Pa., E16
McDermott, Jim, Wash., E17
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E14, E19
Montgomery, G.V. (Sonny), Miss., E18
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E15
Ros-Lehtinen, Ileana, Fla., E14
Roth, Toby, Wis., E14
Stokes, Louis, Ohio, E20
Stump, Bob, Ariz., E17
Torkildsen, Peter G., Mass., E20
Torricelli, Robert G., N.J., E15
Walsh, James T., N.Y., E13

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to help@eids05.eids.gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $112.50 for six months, $225 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $118 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.