room and members of the committee sitting there and saying, yeah, well, we told you so. Those welfare cheats. That is all they want the money for is so they can buy cigarettes.

I wrote all that down, I remember specifically, because I thought it was such a tragedy. I do not want us to make the same mistake out here in our welfare reform package. The poor among us are really important. They do not have a lot and they only take up a very small part of our budget. If we look at the whole budget, and we consider Medicaid and housing and food stamps and family support, and those sorts of things, it takes up a very small part of our budget. Yet somehow in this country we want to make the poor the scapegoats for all the problems that we are having here with respect to balancing our budget. Let us not do that, please.

I recall a very important scripture where it said in the end time we will all come before the judgment and the Lord will say, ''Enter my good and faithful servant. You have been faithful in a few things; I am going to make you master over many.'' And we will say, ''Well, when did I do that?'' And it says that He will say, ''Well, when you did it unto the least of these, My brother, you did it unto Me. When I was hungry, you gave Me food. When I was without clothes, you clothed Me. When I was thirsty, you gave Me drink. When I was in prison, you visited Me.''

That is what is important, too. We should not, any of us here, just because we need to crunch numbers, or because we need to satisfy ourselves that the poor are the cause of our troubles, forget that we have a responsibility to be our brother's keeper.

DISCUSSIONS BETWEEN DEMOCRATS AND REPUBLICANS SHOULD REFLECT REALITY

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I will say to my friend from Illinois, before he leaves the floor, he is one of the most gentle, one of the kindest persons on this floor. And oftentimes when a Member comes to the mike on the floor, Mr. Speaker, it is an advantage to follow someone who is not very popular and who is a scoundrel. I have the unlucky draw today to follow the most gentle Member of the House, but I do that nonetheless.

Mr. Speaker, I did not plan to speak today. As the Speaker knows, I have been in the Chair for the past 3 hours and I have had the benefit of listening to discussions on both sides of the aisle.

My friend from Missouri, Mr. VOLKMER, says what a benefit, and it has been beneficial. Not surprisingly, both sides are subjective, as I am. I am guilty of that. But I want to try to add some balance to this in my brief 5 minutes.

One of my friends who sits here to my left now conveniently remembered some of the bad fiscal times under President Reagan. But as was mentioned subsequent to his speech, he conveniently forgot about the fiscal chaos that occurred in the Carter years. Well, this is only natural, I think. I think it is convenient for Democrats to remember the bad for Republicans, and the Republicans to remember the bad for the Democrats. That is only natural, and that is part of the nature of the beast, but I think when we do it so consistently then we are seeking out a balance that we need to retrieve and bring it back into the realm of discussion.

When I was last home, Mr. Speaker, a woman came to me, one of my constituents, and she said answer a question for me. She said, as best I remember the last time the Government was shut down, prior to this last time, she said it was in 1991. And I think it was, indeed, in 1991. And she said to me, the spin from the media then was that President Bush shut down the Government. And she said, even I blamed him. But she said, now, virtually no one from the media is pointing an accusatory finger to the President. They are saying NEWT GINGRICH or the majority Republican Congress has shut it down.

I am wondering, and I do not want to sound paranoid, Mr. Speaker, but I am wondering, is it convenient to blame a President when he happens to be a Republican and to exonerate a Congress when it happens to be controlled by the Democrats? I am afraid that is the spin that we are taking. What is good for the goose is good for the gander.

Many people today have blamed the Congress for veterans not receiving their checks, if they, in fact, do not receive their checks. President Clinton had every opportunity to sign the appropriations bill into law this week and those checks would have been forthcoming. I cannot for the life of me figure why that would be the fault of the Congress.

Am I missing something, America? As my friend from Ohio says: Wake up, Congress.

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

Mr. COBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask the gentleman that very question, if I had missed something.

Correct me if I am wrong, is it not true that the President vetoed three appropriations bills, and that had he signed them, the Government would be up and running again today, right now?

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I know of two. It may well be three. Two comes to my mind. Is it three?

Mr. HOKE. The third was vetoed.

Mr. COBLE. So it is three. So my friends and the viewers who are watching C–SPAN now, let us come back into reality here and let us add balance to this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, as is obvious, I am not prepared, because I am doing this impromptu, but I am grateful for having had this time and I yield back the balance of my time.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to the President or the viewing audience.

PRESIDENT SAYS IT IS POSSIBLE TO BALANCE BUDGET BY 2002 AND MEET GOP GOAL

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

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I saw this morning in the Baltimore Sun this report, and it was so stunning to me that I just have to read part of it to you, Mr. Speaker. I want to be sure not to offend the gentleman from Texas, and I want to make it clear that I am addressing my remarks to you, Mr. Speaker.

In the paper it says, ''In a positive signal, Clinton told reporters before the meeting'', this is before yesterday's meeting with Speaker GINGRICH and with Majority Leader DOLE, says ''In a positive signal, Clinton told reporters before the meeting that he now thinks it is possible to reach the GOP goal of a balanced budget by 2002 using the conservative economic calculations by CBO.''

Let me read that again, Mr. Speaker, It says, ''In a positive signal, Clinton told reporters before the meeting that he now thinks it is possible to reach the GOP goal of a balanced budget by 2002 using the conservative economic calculations by CBO.'' He said this yesterday. At that point, it had been 29 days since he had personally signed his name to a piece of legislation known as a continuing resolution that included the language that said that he agreed to work with the Congress to achieve a CBO-scored balanced budget by 2002 and that he would do this before the end of this term.

Now, here he told reporters yesterday that now he thinks it is possible to reach that goal using CBO numbers. What is going on? Did he not read the legislation that he himself had signed?

□ 1715

Was the President not aware of what he had signed? Did the President not read that paragraph in the continuing resolution that said that he was agreeing to actually come forward with a CBO-scored balanced budget by the year 2002? Did he not read it? Does not he read the legislation he signs?

Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand this. Here he acts with complete surprise that now he is saying that gosh, he thinks it is possible to reach that

goal of a balanced budget by the year 2002.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BUDGET IMPASSE REQUIRES COMPROMISE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

FEDERAL WORKERS UNFAIRLY BURDENED BY BUDGET IMPASSE

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

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

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

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