home care. It completely ignores it. So we know there is going to be a shortage of beds in nursing homes.

The same thing with regard to children. Medicaid historically over the last 5 or 10 years has been able to absorb the number of children who are no longer covered by private health insurance. In other words, ever since the late 1980's, with all the downsizing and we had large unemployment then and we continue to have an unemployment problem, a lot of parents, when they lost their health insurance, their children were not covered. Because the Congress, under the Democratic leadership, had actually expanded the opportunities where Federal money went to the States, particularly to cover children, and States were encouraged to match those funds on a one-to-one basis, most of the children who were taken off health insurance, because their parents lost it when they lost their jobs or changed jobs, were actually covered by Medicaid. Because as those numbers of children without health insurance grew, Medicaid took up the slack and expanded.

This is a survey that was done by the Journal of the American Medical Association, published again in November's Washington Post, at a time when we were having the big budget battle here. They point out again that that is going to be completely reversed.

If you block grant this money to the States and give them leeway and you cut the rate of growth, so to speak, as the Republicans put it, a lots of States will just cut back on the number of children that are covered. And we will see a lot of children that are simply not covered by Medicaid or by any kind of health insurance whatsoever.

I know that we want to yield the rest of our time to one of our other colleagues. I appreciate the fact that you came, that Ms. DELAURO is on the floor here joining me on this. I know that she and I share the concern about what would happen with Medicare and Medicaid if this Republican budget goes through. Even though it is coming up Thursday and is going to be voted on, we will continue to fight this battle to the end.

Ms. DELAURO. I thank my colleague from New Jersey.

LIBERTY, JUSTICE, AND AN INDEPENDENT JUDICIARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON] is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] for his great kindness in yielding me some of his time this evening. I had wanted this time to speak on liberty, justice, and an independent judiciary.

I come forward because I believe it is my obligation to do so, not as a lawyer, although I happen to be a lawyer, not as a law professor, although I am still a law professor because I continue to teach a seminar at Georgetown Law Center, but as a Member of Congress.

I am moved to come forward this evening because of recent attacks on the judiciary. Those attacks cannot be answered by the judiciary and they have come from this branch. I come forward this evening to make a plea to my colleagues that the cynicism toward Government which has infected the executive branch and the legislative branch, as Americans regard us, stops at the courthouse door.

Recently, from the legislative branch and the executive branch, there have been troubling signals that we may be willing to pull the judiciary into the polarized politics of the 104th Congress and the Presidential campaign. I agree with the dean of the Fordham University Law School, John Furick, who has said, and may I quote him,

> We are at a juncture where we all need to step back, including our President, Congress, governor and mayor, and here he means the governor and mayor of New York, and consider what is at stake when we make our judiciary part of the politics of the present day.

I want to cite two cases that have drawn us into this controversy. They are decisions where I profoundly disagree with what results the courts have reached. One involves Judge Harold Baer. This is the case where the judge initially found that there was an unlawful search and seizure. He threw out the evidence because he found that the police had searched the car when they saw bags being loaded into the car and men running away. And most of us wondered what in the world the judge could be talking about when he said it was reasonable for black men to run away from the cops in this upper Manhattan neighborhood. Thank you very much. As a Member who represents many African Americans, I can tell you that we do not expect people to run away from cops upon seeing them.

New evidence came forward, and the judge reversed himself. Before that happened, Mr. DOLE allowed as how the judge should be impeached because of his initial decision while it was still pending, mind you, and the President stopped short of that but himself criticized the judge very profoundly while the matter was still pending.

This already has had an effect upon the court. The lawyer for the defense himself, and I want to quote his statement, said to the judge in court, asking him to recuse himself, again, I am quoting,

> Never before have the President of the United States, the Speaker of the House, 140 Members of Congress and a Presidential candidate sat in on a case and said that a Federal judge should be impeached or resign.

The defense lawyer then called upon Judge Baer to recuse himself entirely from the case saying, and I am quoting,

> It would appear you may have been influenced by outside forces.

Thus, when the judge heard new evidence, heard evidence that corroborated the initial evidence of the policemen involved, the defense lawyer said, there is still the appearance of impropriety and you should recuse yourself. I am not sure that the judge can ever get that stain off of himself, although it is clear that there was enough evidence before, frankly, and certainly afterward.

There is a second case from New York where I also disagree with the judge. That was one in which Governor Pataki, himself a lawyer, I believe also Mayor Giuliani called for the removal of a criminal court judge. His name was Lauren Duckman. Judge Duckman had lowered the bail of a suspect allowing the suspect to get out of prison and the suspect proceeded to kill his former girlfriend and it was harassment of his former girlfriend that got him in jail in the first place.

I do not think I need to tell anybody who knows me in this body where I stand on that case. The governor said that if the State commission did not remove this judge within 60 days, then he would ask the State Senate to begin removal proceedings.

Judges are often attacked and as public officials should be open to caustic attack, but I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, I have seldom, if ever, seen these kinds of attacks come from the top of the Government.

I am here this evening to say, stop it. Stop it. This is an attack upon our system of Government. It is difficult for judges to respond.

To his credit, from the top of the judiciary, the Chief Judge, the Chief Justice, Mr. Rehnquist, has in his own way responded, in a speech at the American University Law School. He responded in very lawyer-like fashion, referring to precedent, particularly the impeachment in 1805 of Justice Samuel Chase because of the way he handled three cases. The Senate, however, refused to convict and convictions must take place in the Senate.

Mr. Rehnquist noted the precedent and its viability for more than 200 years, for almost 200 years, and indicated he thought that precedent should stand. He also cited the infamous case of President Franklin Roosevelt who attempted but failed to pack the Supreme Court with extra justices when he thought, frankly, that the Republic was going to fall because the New Deal programs designed to save us from a catastrophic depression were put in jeopardy by the response of the judiciary. Even given the seriousness of those cases and the seriousness of the Baer case and the Duckman case which I have just alluded to, there is no case so serious that it is worth the attacks we have recently seen. I believe Mr. DOLE has pulled back. I believe President Clinton has pulled back. I am here to say, let us all pull back.

Judges must be subject to the same kind of criticism that other public servants are, except that restraint is

necessary because, unlike the executive and unlike the legislature, the courts must be entirely independent, free from outside influence. And that depends upon the way we, especially we in public office, behave.

Justice Breyer was in Russia in 1992 and sat in on a meeting between President Yeltsin and 500 Russian judges. And the justices reports that Mr. Yeltsin said to the 500 Russian justices, there are going to be changes made in the judiciary in Russia. For one thing, the prosecutor is not always going to win.

The prosecutor always wins; indeed, the parliament always wins in totalitarian regimes. I do not speak as Justice Rehnquist did as a judge. I have no desire to be a judge. I speak as a legislator. Understanding that the Judiciary is dependent upon the self-imposed restraint that this body and the Executive has almost always exercised for more than 200 years, the system demands restraint by us. Otherwise the judiciary itself is undermined, but, much more importantly, our Democratic form of government is undermined.

□ 2215

That is exactly what Alexander Hamilton said in a terse, but piercing, statement, and I quote Hamilton:

> There is no liberty, he said, if the power of judging be not separated from the legislative and executive power.

Are we going to go back to Henry VII, when it is said he ruled his law with his judges?

We can have very little to do with judges except insofar as the President and the Senate participate in their appointment.

One commentator recently has written that the recent controversy about these cases, and I am quoting, should have dispelled any lingering doubt that the Judiciary and the nominating process for judges are destined to be entangled in partisan politics this election year possibly in a way not seen before, end quote.

Oh no, let us not pierce the separation of powers during the 104th Congress. We have polarized the country and this body enough. We push the envelope way too far when we draw judges and courts into our partisan disputes.

It is fair game to criticize decisions, it is fair game to criticize judges. It takes judgment to know when to stop. It takes discipline in this body and in the Executive to know when to stop.

This is a part of our history that is most revered. It begins before our forbears came to these shores. It took hundreds of years in England for the parliament to wrest its own superiority from the king. That was the beginning of English democracy. But the judges were still subservient to the parliament, so the parliament got greater democracy by pulling power from the monarch, but had no intention whatsoever of creating an independent judiciary initially. It took those who framed our Constitution to truly develop the notion of an independent, totally untainted, totally nonpartisan judiciary.

The Founders therefore took the British legacy, which included parliamentary supremacy, several steps further. The British had no written constitution. The Framers insisted upon a written constitution. But in order for the Constitution to matter, to guard the new Nation and its processes and its citizens, somebody had to be in charge of interpreting it. That was the role of an independent judiciary, and in order to make sure that liberty was guarded, nobody could tamper with the judges whose job it was to interpret the Constitution and the rights that flow from it.

So, as one commentator has said, if, meaning if the judges, were not entirely independent, and I am quoting, the Constitution's promise of a government of limited powers could be broken with utter impunity. The Founders thus rendered Federal jusges independent of the political departments not only with respect to their tenure and salary, but, more importantly, in their source of judicial authority.

It is this additional step, inconceivable in England, that made the American Constitution truly revolutionary. Without the judges there untouched and untouchable, the whole thing known as American democracy, the whole thing known as our former government, collapses in your laps. What has kept if from collapsing thus far? Amazingly, self-restraint. Self-restraint in this body and in the other body, self-restraint of the Executive; that is all that has done it. That is what separates us from the juntas and the banana republics and the totalitarian regimes.

Separation of powers is not a cliche, but it is a very ambiguous concept. What in the world does separation of powers truly mean? When you consider the supremacy of the legislature in our form of government, what separation of powers means is certainly not absolute. We, or the Senate, confirms judges. The President appoints judges, so clearly they do not spring from somebody's forehead. They are, in fact, touched by us initially. At the other end they can be removed only by impeachment, and we cannot reduce their compensation.

One writer has said that there is a twilight zone in between. You can appoint them, you can confirm them, and you can remove them for high crimes and misdemeanors, which is why Mr. DOLE'S comment was totally out of order, because whatever these judges had done did not amount to high crime, it amounted to a wrong decision.

If you can bring them in, and you can put them out with lots of safeguards attached to both ends, what can you do in between, the so-called twilight zone? A lot, and not very much. Public servants, whether they serve on the bench in the executive or in the Congress, are subject to public criticism and public scrutiny. But we are all different. We are different from the Executive, we are different from the judiciary. But the Executive and the legislature are much more alike than the judiciary is like either of us.

This is not a civic lesson, my colleagues. This is a warning from one of your Members. It is up to us to raise this point. It is up to us to signal that we do not mean to cross over the line to pierce the wall of separation of powers. That is not our intent, I do not believe it is the intent of any Member of this body, I do not believe it is the indent of the President of the United States, but I do believe that in the heat of argument it is very easy to do. Step back, step back.

The courts have been utterly principled on the separation of powers. The courts have defended our separate power. The courts have consistently, using the speech and debate clause, prevented any interference with out deliberations and have given the most liberal interpretation to the speech and debate clause, coining even the principle of legislative independence.

Each branch is coequal, but we are very different, and those differences must be respected or the 104th Congress will go down not only as the most calamitous, boisterous, raucous Congress, but as a Congress that lost respect for our form of government and helped to bring shame upon it. That is not the intent of any Member of this body.

I go very far and thought I should leave you with some examples of just how far I go when it comes to allowing, indeed encouraging, criticism of the judiciary. On March 18, 1986, Senator CHARLES GRASSLEY, a Republican of Iowa, mailed a questionnaire to article 3 judges, and it makes some of them very uncomfortable; does not make me uncomfortable. Lots of controversy about it. He asked them about their workloads, he asked them to fill out a questionnaire. These are sitting judges, they are article 3 judges. Everybody got it except the Supreme Court Justices. They were supposed to talk about their workloads, the use of law clerks and their outside teaching activities, their travel to conferences. I found most of it pretty mundane. What had not happened before is a sitting Member sending a questionnaire to judges.

Look, we get the money, we appropriate money. I do not know we cannot know something about the way in which courts operate. Some of the questions might have made some people uncomfortable; for example including does your court have a procedure for certifying opinions for publication? Or a motion of a party? Some have suggested that court policies regarding the publication of opinion and withdrawal of published opinions foster a number of problems, including an unfairness to litigants, a loss of judicial accountability and uncertainty about Presidential

status and actual judicial economy. What is your view of these suggestions? Are you involved in extracurricular activities such as teaching, lecturing, writing law review articles and making public opinions? If so, how much time do you spend on these activities, including preparation and travel?

Some people would say, hey, it is an independent judiciary. You are in the Congress. When you ask them questions, people may think you are trying to intimidate them. I do not think so. I think that if we are appropriating article 3 courts every year that we have a right to know something about their activities.

I leave a very large space for criticism and inquiry.

Mr. DOLE and Mr. Clinton have had an exchange. Mr. DOLE has criticized the ABA. I profoundly disagree with that. Just because you do not like the fact that some liberal judges have escaped, have gotten through, the scrutiny of the ABA because all this was a dupe, frankly, is to tell us about competence. I do not know why you want to throw the ABA out because it does not stop judges at the courthouse door if they happen not to meet your ideological tests. Nevertheless, Mr. DOLE has made an issue of the ABA. He has also made an issue of President Clinton's nominees. He has said that, and he used their caustic language, that it was a bunch of liberal judges and that they disregard the law, and he said some pretty excoriating things.

□ 2230

''A startling number of Mr. Clinton's lower court appointees have demonstrated an outright hostility to law enforcement.''

Fair criticism. I do not agree with it, but fair criticism. In return, Mr. Clinton has said that 67 of his appointees have received the highest rating of the ABA, compared to 52 percent of George Bush's nominees, 53 percent of Ronald Reagan's, and 57 percent of Jimmy Carter's; so he says, ''Look, this is all about qualifications. So far my judges are the highest qualified. That is all you can look at.'' Moreover, he said Mr. DOLE voted for 182 out of 185 of his nominees.

Mr. DOLE responds, ''Hey, I voted for them because of your prerogative. You cannot pin those judges on me.'' They can go back and forth like this during the entire presidential campaign and not offend me at all, not offend the separation of powers, not offend an independent judiciary. But when you call for impeachment of a judge, you send a chill through every judge in the United States. When you say you had better start impeachment proceedings, you who are an independent commission, or we the Governor, or we the legislature are going to do it, you send a chill. Neither of those chills is deserved. Both of those chills the entire system of government that is the United States.

Mr. Speaker, judges are controversial for a very important reason. That is because, as de Tocqueville said, ''Hardly any question arises in the United States that is not resolved sooner or later in a judicial question.'' If that was true in the 19th century, imagine how much more true it is today. Yes, this is a high stakes game. Yes, judges in our system of government have much more power than judges generally have. But yes, we can tolerate it. We know where to stop. We love this system, and the last thing any Member wants to do is to destroy it.

The principle of separation of powers, of an independent judiciary, of limited government, and of constitutional government are more important than Judge Baer's decision in the New York City case, are more important than Judge Duckman's decision in the case of the woman who was murdered. Yes, judges are human and they will make mistakes, and some of them will be profound, and some others of them will be outrageous. But we will not throw away 200 years of a magnificent constitutional system because two judges make a mistake. We will not do this. This Member comes to the floor to announce that she believes she is speaking for Members of the House and Senate and the President of the United States when she says we will not do this.

We will carry on the 1996 campaign with a lot more vigor and raunchiness than I would like, but it is going to happen. It is going to be a nasty, ugly campaign. So be it. That can happen between the two branches, and in a Presidential campaign. I do not like it. There is nothing illegal about it. There is nothing about it that risks our system of government. If we must punch each other out, as we have all during the 104th Congress, so be it. I ask my colleagues only one thing: As we go at one another, just leave the judges and the courts out of it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. If I could, Mr. Speaker, I will sum up a statement on the arms transfer to Pakistan and the United States response to Chinese nuclear transports. This is with regard to events taking place over the weekend.

I wanted to express my strong concern about these two recent developments that will affect the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms in the South Asia region. First, after months of negotiations, it was announced last Friday that the United States will not punish the People's Republic of China for its sale to Pakistan of 5,000 ring magnets, devices used for the production of weapons-grade enriched uranium, in direct violation of provisions of the nonproliferation Act.

The official rationale for taking no action against the Chinese was that Beijing had committed itself not to make any such transfers in the future and that the Chinese would help us to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and consult with us on export control policies.

Secretary of State Christopher indicated that the United States had no hard evidence to counter China's denials of any knowledge of the transfers to Pakistan, even though there is strong evidence that the particular Chinese companies that sold the ring magnets have in fact been identified.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong concern about two recent developments that will affect the proliferation of nuclear and conventional arms in the South Asia region.

First, after months of negotiations, it was announced last Friday that the United States will not punish the People's Republic of China for its sale to Pakistan of 5,000 ring magnets, devices used for the production of weapons-grade enriched uranium—in direct violation of provisions of the Non-Proliferation Act. The official rationale for taking no action against the Chinese was that Beijing had committed itself not to make any such transfers in the future, and that the Chinese would help us to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and consult with us on export control policies. Secretary of State Christopher indicated that the United States had no hard evidence to counter China's denials of any knowledge of the transfers to Pakistan—even though there is strong evidence that the particular Chinese companies that sold the ring magnets have, in fact, been identified.

Interestingly, in last Saturday's New York Times, accompanying the article about the decision not to sanction China for the nuclear equipment transfers, was an article entitled ''Tread Carefully With China, Business Leaders Urge U.S.'' Leaders of the Business Council, meeting with government officials in Williamsburg, VA, urged that differences with China over not only nuclear proliferation, but also a wide range of human rights concerns and piracy of American music, movies, and software, should not get in the way of our economic relationship with China.

Now, in today's Washington Post we read that there may have been even less to the Chinese pledge of cooperation than initially met the eye. In the official Chinese statement, there was no specific reference to future sales of ring magnets, nor was there any specific pledge that sales of similar, nuclear-related gear to would-be nuclear proliferators would not recur. In a clever bit of diplomatic slight of hand, our diplomats essentially said that they thought the Chinese meant to make these promises, and as long as the Chinese didn't publicly contradict our statement, it would look like we had a deal. I fear that we got nothing more than another empty promise from the Chinese leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that this administration has sought to expand American trade and investment in the emerging markets of the world, and there is much that is positive about this strategy. But, when it comes to China, I believe we had to draw a line—particularly with regard to this reckless Chinese policy of assisting the nuclear weapons development program of Pakistan, a country that has repeatedly shown itself to be unstable, a country that has trained and financed terrorist movements, a country that has openly shown itself to be hostile to United States and Western interests.

Sadly, it appears that the Clinton administration is pursuing the same policy as the Bush administration pursued with regard to China,

arguing that increased business links would help modify Chinese behavior. This policy has essentially forced us to sweep one outrage after another under the rug, with the nuclear proliferation issue being only the latest in a series of outrages.

Mr. Speaker, in another issue that could have lasting effects on security in the strategically important South Asia region, I regret to point out that the administration is also going forward with the shipment of $368 million worth of sophisticated conventional arms to Pakistan. Plans call for shipping the weapons to Pakistan after the completion of the elections in India—the logic being, apparently, to avoid making the arms transfer an issue in the elections, despite the fact that it has been widely known for weeks that the shipment would happen. This ill-advised proposal that will only contribute to instability and weapons proliferation in the region.

A provision in the fiscal year 1996 foreign operations appropriations authorizes the transfer of $368 million in sophisticated conventional weaponry, including three Navy P–3C antisubmarine aircraft, 28 Harpoon missiles, 360 AIM–9L missiles, and other Army and Air Force equipment. This provision, known as the Brown amendment, after its Senate sponsor, passed the Senate last year. Although the provision was never debated in the House, it carried in conference. I drafted a letter to the conferees, which was signed by 40 other Members from both sides of the aisle urging that this provision not be included in the bill. But, owing in large part to the support of the administration and the influence of the pro-Pakistan lobby, the provision was included in the bill and became law.

As far back as last summer, many of us in Congress—Democrats and Republicans, Members of both bodies—argued that providing these weapons to Pakistan was a bad idea, given Pakistani behavior. About a year ago, it was reported that Pakistan received Chinese M–11 missiles, in direct violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. These missiles, in direct violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime. These missiles are capable of carrying nuclear warheads, and can strike cities within a 275-mile radius. It was also reported last year that Pakistan developed its nuclear weapons from a blueprint provided by the PRC, and Pakistan then gave this blueprint to Iran. Pakistan remains an unstable nation, where the military does not seem to be under strong civilian control, a country which supports the embargo of Israel and does not recognize the State of Israel.

Yet here we are, Mr. Speaker, forgiving the outrageous behavior of both Pakistan and China.

It is important to recognize that Pakistan has not agreed to do anything in exchange for the release of the arms—the shipment of which was seized pursuant to the Pressler amendment. Named for its Senate sponsor, the Pressler amendment, mandates an annual Presidential certification that Pakistan does not possess a nuclear explosive device. If such a certification cannot be made, under the law, all United States military assistance to Pakistan must be ended—including weapons already paid for but not delivered. In 1993, President Clinton did offer to return all or some of the weapons in the pipeline if Pakistan would agree to cap its nuclear program. Pakistan rejected this offer. In fact, by receiving the ring magnets from China, Pakistan was continuing to act—in defiance of the United States—to further its nuclear ambitions.

Finally, the administration came up with a compromise: while 28 F–16 fighter jets would not be delivered to Pakistan—they already have 40 F–16's—the $368 million worth of military equipment would be delivered with no strings attached.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, Pakistan gets its weapons—our weapons—and we receive nothing in return.

Mr. Speaker, the delivery of these weapons to Pakistan will be seen by India as a slap in the face. India, the world's second most populous country, is in the process of completing the largest exercise in democracy in world history. India's elections, despite a few isolated incidents of violence, were conducted very smoothly. While the implications of the election results are somewhat unclear, what is clear is that this election represents the free expression of hundreds of millions of citizens in a vast, diverse, and free nation. Contrast these democratic elections with the dictatorship in China. Contrast the ability of hundreds of millions of people to express their views without fear of reprisals with the ongoing atmosphere of political violence that continues to tear Pakistan apart.

In addition to sharing our democratic values, India has also been pursuing a historic free-market economic reform. In fact, the United States has in the past few years become India's largest trading partner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the administration to end this tilt toward Pakistan and China. We must work to promote not only free markets, which are an extremely important consideration, but also democracy. Based on these criteria, we should be working for improved relations with India.

IMPORTANT ISSUES WHICH DEFINE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN REPUBLICANS AND DEMOCRATS IN THE 104TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHABOT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to address my colleagues in this obviously empty Chamber, even at this late hour, because I am going to be discussing some issues that I think are of paramount importance and which define the differences between the Republican and Democratic Parties in the 104th Congress.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I happened to hear the first half hour of the last hour, which involved comments by my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], regarding our budget proposal, which will be coming to the House floor here in the next couple of days. This is the budget proposal for the coming Federal fiscal year which will begin on October 1 of this year.

As is very typical, he made very disparaging remarks about our plans to save Medicare from bankruptcy and our plans to reform Medicaid into a block grant program for the States. These tactics are not isolated to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] alone. They run rampant through the national Democratic Party today, as the Democratic Party has seized on this particular issue to frighten and scare Americans in the hopes that they can, by employing these kinds of tactics, regain control of the House and Senate in the November elections.

Mr. Speaker, what we get, instead of constructive debate on the House floor, are what I would prefer to call drive-by special orders. In fact, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is still present. He is standing toward the rear of the Chamber, grinning. I would invite him to return to this very podium where he made his comments and engage in actual debate, rather than stand up and demagogue on these issues.

The first thing, Mr. Speaker, the American people need to know is that the Republican and Democratic Party, if you use President Clinton's budget proposal as their blueprint for reforming Medicare, are roughly $30 billion apart. In the context of a 6-year balanced budget plan, that is a very small difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

But again, we would never know that to listen to my Democratic colleagues, who insist on demagoguing this issue, and who, frankly, never mention that President Clinton, the leader of their party, has put forward a plan to reform Medicare by reducing the growth in Medicare expenditures.

Another way of putting that is that both the Republicans and Democrats want, at least, again, if you use President Clinton's proposal and not the comments of the far left wing of his party in the House and Senate, if you use his proposal, we both want to increase Medicare spending but at a slower rate, at a sustainable rate, in order to save the program from bankruptcy.

Before he might have to depart, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. KINGSTON].

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, even though there are only a few of us present now, I am going to pose a pop quiz to the House. The question is who made the following statement:

> Today, Medicaid and Medicare are going up at three times the rate of inflation. We propose to let it go up at two times the rate of inflation. That is not, I repeat, not a Medicare or Medicaid cut. And we have kept private sector increases so they won't go up as much. So only in Washington do people believe that no one can get by on twice the rate of inflation. So when you hear all this business about cuts, let me caution you, that is not what is going on.

Now, who made those comments: President Clinton or NEWT GINGRICH, the Speaker of the House? If you guessed President Clinton, you were