

Personal responsibility, Mr. GINGRICH? It is not even close. It is arrogance.

And we also heard this talk about a family-friendly Congress. That is a hoot. That is a real hoot for Members here.

□ 1830

You see Members dropping out in droves because of this schedule and the madness that we have gone through for the past year.

But forget us for a moment. Think about the innocent families that are being disadvantaged by this shutdown. Think about those families and the impact that they feel. A young woman calls me, a college student, had a chance to go on a mission for a church to Haiti over Christmas. That was going to be her gift to poor people, and she could not get a passport. Another family called, having tried to sell a home in their family estate for month after month, had to cancel the closing because the Veterans' Administration cannot process papers because of the Gingrich shutdown.

Now the Gingrich folks say this is a matter of personal responsibility. It is a matter of principles. Let me tell you, it is not a matter of principle if it is somebody else's paycheck on the line. It is a matter of principle to put your own paycheck on the line.

The reason I became so angry and objected a minute ago to the District of Columbia appropriation is because the bill that should have been brought to the floor would include a bill from the Senate that has my bill in it, "no budget, no pay." A bill that says when the budget shuts down, we stop issuing congressional paychecks.

You know what would happen if Members of Congress did not get their paychecks? This crisis would be over in a heartbeat. Over in a heartbeat. You would start counting the case for these paid vacations and recesses and realize you are not going to get paid. I have given up my congressional salary during the shutdown. It is painful for me and my family.

I guarantee you if every Member of Congress did it, if Speaker GINGRICH did it, if Mr. DELAY, who considers him some constitutional officer of some kind, or Mr. ARMEY did it, they would think twice about another recess while this Government is shut down. They would think twice about congressional junkets and trips. They would think about doing the business of this country.

Why in the world are we taking it out on all of these innocent people, hundreds of thousands of people? If you have a problem, show your statement of principle, show your character, put your own paycheck on the line. Do not take it out on the innocent people across this country.

Let me close by saying this: We are seeing the face of modern Republicanism, the face of Gingrich Republicanism, and it is a mean face. It is a face

that looks for innocent victims. Is it any wonder that the Democrats and President Clinton have second thoughts about the Gingrich budget plan? We see what they will do with the Government shutdown. Imagine what they will do if they get to write this budget for the next 7 years.

#### FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, in all of the debate and the rancor over the current budget problems that we are facing, some other more fundamental problems seem to be being lost. One of those I was reflecting on today and would like to bring to the attention of this body, and that is a pattern of conduct on the part of this administration, an attitude, if you will, on the part of this administration, to disregard constitutional powers involving the separation of powers between the different branches of government, namely the Congress of the United States and the presidency.

Mr. Speaker, since assuming my seat in this Congress last year, I have witnessed a series of constitutionally suspect acts and pronouncements by the current administration, beginning with the administration's unilateral and unauthorized bailout of the Mexican peso, through the White House's cavalier approach to Congressional authorization for approval of U.S. troop deployment in Bosnia, to the recent pattern of circumventing Congressional authority over the government's power to borrow.

I have seen, Mr. Speaker, a deeply disturbing and troubling trend, raising the specter of an administration overstepping the proper and constitutional bounds of executive power.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that from the beginning many of us in this Congress viewed the administration's Mexican peso bailout as unwise monetary policy. The practical legacy of that ill-advised decision will reverberate to the national detriment through the financial community, and indeed our local communities, for many years to come. These problems will occupy me and me colleagues on the Committee on Banking and Financial Services in the coming months.

What troubles me, Mr. Speaker, from a constitutional perspective, is the way in which the administration finessed the underlying legal issue of whether the President and the Treasury Secretary had the authority to jeopardize our national treasury in the first instance.

When I wrote to Treasury Secretary Rubin questioning the legality of using U.S. resources to guarantee the government securities of another country, I received assurances from his general counsel that "This is a consideration of

monetary and foreign policy," and that it is "an area that is properly left to the discretion of the President and, acting with the President's approval, the Secretary of the Treasury."

Mr. Speaker, such a response does worse than insult the intelligence, it ignores the Constitution. The administration's attitude on executive prerogative was demonstrated again during the debate over the deployment of troops to Bosnia. In the November 23, 1995, edition of the Tampa Tribune, for example, Clinton spokesman McCurry was asked about the funding for this mission. He said "The importance of the mission that we must undertake here will not be circumscribed by funding." He then assured, Mr. Speaker, reporters that the President "Will figure out how to pay for it, one way or another."

Mr. Speaker, I worry greatly that "One way or another" is a thinly veiled reference to move in a way that is constitutionally impermissible. Mr. Speaker, it is black letter constitutional law that with the Congressional power of appropriation in Article I goes right to specify how appropriated monies shall be spent, a congressional and parliamentary understanding more than 300 years old.

This cavalier attitude by the President and his staff on Congressional approval represents an entirely unaccountable shift in the constitutional understanding that has governed the relationship between the several branches of the Federal Government for over 250 years. This problem with the abuse of executive power has most recently been demonstrated by the administration's approach to the debt limit and the misuse of government trust funds in violation of Congressional power to set borrowing limits, power vested in the Congress by the Constitution. The use of government funds by the Thrift Savings Board clearly demonstrates, Mr. Speaker, that this Executive Branch is issuing new debt instruments and thwarting Congress' exclusive power to control the national debt.

In light of this pattern of conduct, Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that this body, this Congress, and its appropriate oversight responsibility, initiate hearings and begin to take strong measures that will restore the proper balance between these two branches of the government. This looming notion of "Government by Executive" has plainly gotten out of the control, and the people of the United States, in Congress assembled, should not tolerate these such usurpations of their authority vested in them by the Constitution.

#### CONGRESS SHOULD TAKE THE RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP GOVERNMENT RUNNING

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