have all of Monday without any limitation, is that what I hear? How long do you anticipate that we would then be going on Monday?

Mr. ARMEY. Monday evening.

Mr. MINETA. No set time?

Mr. ARMEY. No, there would be no set time. Of course, participation is determined by the number of Members here. We would obviously like to get as much of that debate out of the way while still retaining some opportunity for the principals to have some statements before the end of debate.

Mr. MINETA. I would also like to ask, the Pennsylvania primary or I guess Philadelphia city elections are on Tuesday, and there have been some comments from our colleagues in the Philadelphia area about that. So if they are not able to be back for Monday night's general debate, would they still be able to do general debate or at least make some statements on Tuesday?

Mr. ARMEY. We would try to accommodate that. Of course as you know the reason we have determined not to have votes Monday night is out of consideration for those folks. Certainly we will talk to them. And of course the sponsor of the amendment would want to have some comments prior to the vote on Tuesday and perhaps one or two others, so we will try to be as accommodating as possible.

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

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would ask the distinguished majority leader, I am troubled to hear of even the possibility that this budget might get as little as 4 hours of time. It has been described as a revolutionary budget, and I know as one of I guess what would be the chief revolutionaries you would have some concern about explaining it fully, and that is barely 1 hour for $100 billion of Medicare cuts, and I would hope you would work with the Committee on Rules so that we could have a full and complete debate extending over at least a couple of days to explore what this budget means for ordinary American families.

Mr. ARMEY. Let me just say I thank the gentleman from Texas for that observation, and as I said to the gentleman from Missouri, we will work with the Committee on Rules to get as full a debate as we can.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GEPHARDT. I thank the gentleman.

FORMAT FOR MORNING HOUR DEBATES AND SPECIAL ORDERS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the House of January 4, 1995, relating to morning hour debates be continued through the adjournment of the 2d session of the 104th Congress sine die, except that on Tuesdays the House shall convene for such debates 1 hour earlier than the time otherwise established by order of the House rather than 90 minutes earlier; and the time for such debates shall be limited to 25 minutes allocated to each party rather than 30 minutes to each; but in no event shall such debates continue beyond the time that falls 10 minutes before the appointed hour for the resumption of legislative business, and with the understanding that the format for recognition for special order speeches first instituted on February 23, 1994, be continued for the same period.

Mr. DOGGETT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, these morning hour debates are very important to both sides and I understand there has been consultation on this. We applaud the gentleman's effort.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 15, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Monday next for morning hour debates.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1995

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 17, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 18, 1995, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 18, 1995, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, on Thursday, May 18, 1995, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute speeches.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET DOES NOT CUT MEDICARE

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

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, for the last few days, liberal Democrats have taken to the floor to denounce so-called Medicare cuts.

What cuts?

Where are they?

This chart clearly shows that under the House Republican budget, Medicare funding will increase.

This year, we will spend over $150 billion on Medicare.

This will not decrease.

Let me be absolutely clear about this—Medicare funding will not decrease.

Under the House Republican plan, Medicare spending will have increased to about $230 billion by the year 2002.

Let me say that again—Medicare spending will be $230 billion in the year 2002. Now, if Medicare spending is $150 billion this year and $230 billion seven years from now, that is an increase in Medicare spending. Where's the cut?

Only in Washington could an increase be a cut.

Well, the American people are tired of the old Washington accounting methods. Those methods are the very reason we have a $5 trillion debt.

Republicans are committed to scrapping the old Washington accounting methods and replacing them with the truth, something not often seen around here.

MEDICARE INCREASES

(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, as we go home for Mother's Day, I think all of us know that mothers have that extrasensory perception about when people are fudging. Well, let me tell you, there is going to be a lot of fudging going on here about this budget. You are going to hear it's traditional family values.

But let me ask a question? Do you know any family in America that when they pull up to the table to put their

budget together says let us push the children away and let us push the elderly away, the most vulnerable in the family, so those who are doing real well can get a larger piece of the pie? I do not know any family like that. That is the traditional mogul budget.

So we have really turned it on its head and turned traditional family values into traditional mogul values. And if you are really wondering what to get your mother this year for Mother's Day, they have now answered the question. Send her a check, send her cash. She is going to need at least $900 to $1,000 a year because there is going to be an increase in premiums and an increase in all things that affect her Medicare.

Not a good Mother's Day present.

□ 1315

LET US EXERCISE LEADERSHIP

Mr. BUYER. To my good friend from Colorado, I think there is a big difference between families in America. Her vision is she wants every family in America to drive the very same type of car and for everybody to have the same piece in size.

I submit right now we are going to hear a lot of rhetoric with regard to the Nation's budget.

It is interesting, this morning, though, when I saw C–SPAN, I got to see the Vice President, the minority leader here in the House, the minority leader in the Senate. They were asked a very important question by a member of the press. Intriguing. ''What is your plan to balance the Nation's budget without a tax increase in 7 years?'' They looked at each other, and there was complete silence for a good 4 or 5 seconds. It was wonderful. It reminded me almost of the Three Stooges; I saw Curley, Larry, and Mo. They stood and all kind of looked at each other.

The answer is they have no plan.

So my message is: Stop the squawking, stop the whining, and let us get down and work on the Nation's business, roll up our sleeves, and let us do it. Because this is very serious business.

You want to talk about what happens to the American family, the lady from Colorado, the greatest threat to the American family today is the national debt. That is the greatest threat.

Folks, if we are successful, and it is now 2002, the national debt will be in excess of $7 trillion. Stop squawking, and let us exercise leadership.

CALLING FOR THE NAMING OF AN INDEPENDENT COUNSEL

(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, today marks the 113th day since the formation of the House Ethics Committee, and no substantial action has yet been taken with regard to our imperial Speaker's serious ethics problems. Four very serious complaints have been filed and have been pending before the Ethics Committee now for months, yet no action. It is obvious that an independent counsel is needed. I advise the Ethics Committee to follow the advice that Congressman GINGRICH gave on July 28, 1988, when he said,

> The rules normally applied by the Ethics Committee to an investigation of a typical Member are insufficient in an investigation of the Speaker of the House . . . clearly this investigation has to meet a higher standard of public accountability.

I call on Chairperson JOHNSON and members of the Ethics Committee to quit dragging their feet and name an independent counsel. Inactivity by the Ethics Committee and press releases from the Gingrich legal team will not clear up this most serious situation. An independent counsel will.

PROTECTING OUR CHILDREN'S FUTURE

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

Mr. TATE. Mr. Speaker, within a decade, entitlements and interest will consume the entire national debt, and the President has presented no balanced budget, and the Clinton Democrats across the aisle have continued the status quo.

The Republicans have announced a plan to balance the budget and to protect our children's future, and the Democrats have announced yesterday that they have no plan.

Well, let me tell you, folks, here is their plan. Right here is what they do on Medicare to save it. Right down here is what they do to protect our children. Right down here is what they do to provide tax relief for working families.

Folks, there is no plan. That is the fact. The Republicans have a plan, a plan to balance the budget, protect our children's future and to protect, preserve, and improve Medicare.

The Republicans are willing to stand up to the plate and be counted and protect our future. The Democrats have their plan right here.

Take a look.

REPUBLICAN PLAN UNFAIR TO MOST VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the budget debate next week, I think it is important for the American people to put this in perspective.

We have cut taxes now $600 to $700 billion over the next 10 years to benefit the wealthy peoples. Now we have got to come up with some cuts in the budget to offset that lost revenue, $600 to $700 billion, to offset cuts in taxes for rich people.

Well, we started by trying to do that on the backs of poor people, and we realized that there was not enough money in poor people's programs to do that. So now, next week, we are turning our attention to our senior citizens, and we will try to finish this job under the Republican plan by balancing the budget on the backs of our senior citizens, poor people, senior citizens, balance the budget on their backs, my colleagues say. Unfair to our most vulnerable populations.

PRESERVING THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, yesterday House Republicans offered a plan to balance the Federal budget by the year 2002. Our plan allocates $11 trillion for Federal spending over the next 7 years. It protects Social Security. It eliminates three Cabinet-level departments, 13 agencies and 284 Federal programs, and it provides the much needed tax relief for families, as promised in our Contract With America.

Now, let us look at what will happen if we take the House Democrats' approach and do nothing but maintain the status quo. A child born this year can expect to pay $187,000 over the course of his or her lifetime as a wage earner and taxpayer just in interest on the national debt, and in 2 years, interest on the national debt will exceed defense spending as the single largest item in the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, which alternative would the House choose next week: the status quo or a plan to balance the budget by limiting the growth in Federal spending and eliminating wasteful spending and programs that simply have outlived their usefulness?

The answer is clear. We have to balance the Federal budget. We have a moral imperative to preserve the American dream for our children and our grandchildren.

BALANCE PRIORITIES FIRST

(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, you can take each dollar that the majority plans to spend on the wealthy through their tax break and spend it on older Americans through Medicare and still have moneys to balance the budget come the year 2002.

One wonders why there is such an insistence by the majority to take from the poor and give to the wealthy. When