keep working on this. It is not unprecedented that the President and the Congress have had disagreements over the budget. For 2 full years under the Reagan administration, we operated under CR's. That is not such a terrible thing. And let the voters decide in November.

But to do this destructive behavior, which is really what it is, it is destructive behavior for ourselves, for our children, for our economy, is just wrong, immoral, and just plain stupid.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman. I really want to thank all my Democratic colleagues for participating in this special order this evening. I think all we are really asking is that we be allowed to bring a continuing resolution, that has already passed in the Senate on a bipartisan basis, to the floor of the House so that we can vote on it.

Unfortunately, what we are hearing from the Republican side, from Speaker GINGRICH and the Republican majority, is not only are they not going to allow the continuing resolution to come up either today or tomorrow—they did not let it come up today— or tomorrow, so that we can vote on it and open up the Government again, but they are actually considering another motion to put us in recess for as much as 3 weeks.

Today is the 19th day of the Government shutdown. If it goes from today until the 23d of January, which is what the motion that passed out of the Committee on Rules today and which we will probably consider tomorrow would allow, you would have to add another 20 days, almost 3 weeks, to that 19 days that the Government has already been shut down. It is already unprecedented, and we hope that that does not happen and we are going to continue to make the point that it should not happen.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, the personal toll resulting from the Federal shutdown is enormous and its effects are far reaching. For thousands of Federal workers, the shutdown means a great financial stretch for many to make mortgage and other payments due. For American taxpayers, it means they are simply not getting their money's worth. Taxpayers have made an investment in these workers and their services to the public, and they are getting no return on their investment. Federal workers have been shut out by the shutdown, and the American taxpayer has been shut out by the shutdown.

In addition to the personal toll, there is a tremendous impact on the environment. Cleanup of Superfund sites has been halted. The 2,800 individuals who are responsible for this important program have been furloughed. Other important environmental enforcement programs have been shut down, including the call-in EPA hotline to report drinking water contamination. Many companies have been put on hold waiting for EPA assistance or permits to conduct their activities. They have been shut out by the shutdown.

In today's Post, there is an article about an EPA contractor which discusses the difficulties imposed by lack of Federal funding for the agency that owes him money. As a result of not being paid, he and scores of other small businesses in the same situation may have to release workers they can no longer afford to pay. These Federal contractors and small businesses have been shut out by the shutdown.

The communities adjacent to parks and lands operated by the Interior Department are losing tourist revenue. In California, Mariposa County has asked Governor Wilson to declare a state of emergency because of the loss of business from visitors to Yosemite National Park. The average 383,000 people who visit national parks each day are shut out by the shutdown.

The loss on all levels is great. The Republicans may be mad at Government, but Federal workers, small businesses, and visitors to our Nation's scenic wonders are not big government or what the Republicans have now relegated to little taxpayers. They are valued workers who deserve to be paid for their work and a public who deserves to get what it pays for.

Balancing the budget in the name of taxpayers is a contradiction when the shutdown is costing them over $40 million a day—over $1.5 billion so far. By your actions to continue the shutdown, you are depriving Federal workers of their earned income and the American taxpayer of a return on their investment.

Balance the budget, but don't shut out our Federal workers and the American public. This balancing act is just too expensive for everyone.

REPUBLICAN VIEW OF BALANCED BUDGET BATTLE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the Speaker and I thank my colleague from Kentucky for joining me this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my friends from the minority just a few moments prior offer a variety of opinions. And indeed as we stand in this Chamber tonight, surrounded by the great law givers of history, in a Chamber that resounds with the echoes of history, again we acknowledge the right of Americans to disagree and at times to disagree profoundly. At this juncture in our history, we have come, once again, to a fundamental argument as to the philosophy and purpose of government.

In the preceding presentation from the minority party, I listened with great interest as time and again well-meaning Members of this House mentioned that they stood for a balanced budget but—and therein is the rub—but.

There is always something that seems to get in the way, and regrettably a quarter century has passed since this government faced up to the notion of balancing the budget. So it is always simple, in terms of rhetorical excess, to divert one's attention from the central goal, and in the midst of a cacophonous presentation, unfurl the venom and vitriol of name calling and things that just do not square with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentleman of this House, and those who join us tonight, there is one central and inescapable fact of our recent time here in this historic 104th Congress. Because once you get past the rhetoric and the apologists for those who would continue to promote a tax-and-spend agenda, once you would get past the rhetoric of victimization that spews forth like unto a flood from the other side, we are faced with one indisputable fact. This government would not face this partial shutdown if the President of the United States would have exercised his constitutional responsibility to sign the appropriations bills.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, in all candor, in all sincerity, the straight talk, the inescapable fact is this: Only one man stands between Government employees and their jobs, and he resides at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Oh, to be sure, those who would continually look for excuses and ways to spend more of your money will tell you it is not so. They will continue to label people with unfair epithets, and that is their right in a free society.

But understand that this President failed to sign those appropriations bills, and understand further, and this is the distressing fact, this President did more than make an agreement. He signed a public law in November saying that he agreed with the notion of balancing the budget within 7 years using honest, nonpartisan numbers as offered by the Congressional Budget Office. And the tragedy of this situation is that this President again abdicates his responsibility. Believe me, there is no joy in having the situation come to this.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would gladly yield to my friend from Kentucky and again I thank him for joining us during the course of this hour.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. The President not only signed his name to that continuing resolution that the gentleman voted for, I believe, and I voted for to allow Government workers to go back to work, with a promise from the President that he by the end of the year would come up with a balanced budget, scored by CBO, that would balance over the next 7 years, buy the end of the year.

Where are we?

□ 2045

We are past the end of the year. Where is the President? Four budgets that he has offered later that did not balance. You are right. He is the gentleman that stands in the way of the Government workers from going back to work.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for making his point.

Reclaiming my time, it is vital that we move forward. But it is also worth

noting that, in the words ironically of the gentleman who now resides at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to quote him from his campaign in 1992, ''Change is hard, change is difficult.'' How unintentionally prophetic the candidate's words were and how tragically cynical that candidate's words were when he said, ''I believe we can balance the budget in 5 years.''

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. One of the things we have to remember as we hear, and the gentleman is a freshman, and I understand, I was listening to some of my Democrat colleagues calling your group a bunch of extremists and so forth. You know, what is interesting is the freshman class has voted on a balanced budget, and that budget has passed both Houses, and it passed.

With the majority of votes in both Houses, and yet the President was the one who vetoed that.

Now, the Democrats who are calling you guys extremists have not submitted a budget or have not voted on a budget. In fact, the President's budget did not get one single vote, Democrat or Republican, including our colleagues who we were entertained by earlier tonight. They have not submitted a balanced budget. They have not voted on a balanced budget.

I think what is so important is, you know, all of this apportioning the blame seems to be going on in a real fervency. It takes our eye off what is important. A balanced budget is what is important. It will lower interest rates. It will create jobs. It will bring down the cost of home mortgages, the cost of automobile payments, student loans and so forth. Even more importantly than that, it will save our country from economic disaster.

You cannot live in a country that has a $4.9 trillion debt and rising. And that debt was brought about by Republicans Democrats. We all know that. Anybody who starts blaming that on one President or one party or the other is fooling themselves. It is a bipartisan part.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINGSTON. I do not control the time. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, while I certainly appreciate the fact my good friend from Florida is here tonight, I will be happy to answer his questions here later tonight.

However, with the deference we showed the minority side, let us first make our points. I will be happy to yield time them.

Seeing my friend from Florida reminds me of a couple of questions he brought up.

First, this morning, in the well of the House with, I guess, a valiant effort to do some stagecraft with the wastepaper basket and simulated checks, but I applaud the gentleman for this: At long last in some perhaps passing way he chose to embrace a tentative economic conservatism and fiscal soundness. I appreciate that in the gentleman from Florida.

But even as he decried in his words the fact that visas were not being issued by this Government, I would respectfully point out to my friends from the minority one of the reasons those visas are not being issued is because members of the minority, when they served as the majority of this House, used this voting card as a Visa card, trying to charge up debt upon debt upon debt on future generations, and, yes, change is difficult, and answers may at times be imperfect.

I wish there could be a straight line. I wish there could be a cogency to this to wrap it up in a neat little package. But the fact is this: As painful and at times confusing as these days may be, to change the culture so pervasive in this town, it is so easy to say tax and spend and spend and spend and spend some more. We have to take measures to do so.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky. You know, this is the bottom line: 40 years of tax and spend with no offer of a balanced budget, and we are continuing to hear from the other side that we are extremists, that we are mean-spirited, that, as one gentleman said this evening, that we were lunatics, that we are completely out of control.

This Government is $5 trillion out of control because liberals in this House for 40 years spent money that they did not have, and they want to continue to do that even though they talk about a balanced budget, and that, you know, that is not fiscal responsibility. That is not common sense.

Where will the Interior workers be in the year 2012 when every tax dollar will be consumed by entitlements and interest on the debt?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield further, I have a lot of Federal employees in my district. I am concerned about them. That is why I supported the Interior bill when it passed. That is why I supported today the veto override on the Commerce, State, Justice bill, which would have allowed the Federal prison employees to be paid, and what I do not quite understand is why our friends who want the Government reopened voted against these bills.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would be happy to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. LOWEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, because I will be delighted to answer the question.

I think you raise, as do all the gentlemen raise, some very important issues, and in fact I think it would be important that we continue this debate on the priorities of our Nation. We serve on the Committee on Appropriations, and you and I know that there are differences of opinions. There are differences of opinion between Democrats and Democrats and Republicans and Republicans.

So I would suggest to the gentleman, and I certainly appreciate the gentleman yielding, that we continue this debate on the priorities of our Nation, but let us open the Government.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. I think what is so important here is let us not go around saying that the NEWT GINGRICH freshmen Republicans have closed down the Government when you know, and the learned distinguished gentlewoman from New York knows, that is not the case. The fact is that when you voted against that bill, you helped close down the Government, just a wee bit. Now, maybe, as an author of the bill, I may be accused of saying well, his bill reached too far, but there is plenty of, in the spirit of reopening the Government and in the spirit of balancing the budget, I would say there is plenty of room for both parties to come to the table, but do not sit over there and vote against the bills and have a President who vetoes the bill and then vote to support his veto and tell us we are closing down the Government.

You know, it is too important to the Federal employees, to the National Park employees, to the prison guard employees in my district, for them to be hearing the games. This is their job. This is real people, real mortgages, real grocery bills, real problems, real jobs, and let us not say that, oh, well, I am going to vote against this bill but it is the Republicans that just did this.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Reclaiming my time, I would simply like to make this point: I find it especially objectionable, indeed, the gentleman from Florida, a fellow freshman, I suppose who is guilty of showing extremely good sense, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], pointed out the fact that Federal Government, the executive branch, went to great expense to send out letters with paychecks attempting to play the blame game and politicize the entire crisis, even with Federal paychecks. I decry that whole notion we should play the blame game.

I am also happy, however, to point out that in the best tradition of the truth will out, in the best tradition of people having all the facts, we are joined by one tonight who fought off the blame game, who gave straight talk to the people of his district in California. It is an honor to welcome back to this Chamber and to this special order my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMPBELL]. I thank the gentleman and welcome him as the newest member of the extremely good-sense bunch. We are happy to have you here. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I thank the gentleman.

I am proud to be part of this special order tonight and proud to be your colleague in this remarkably historic 104th Congress.

I asked to speak tonight as part of the special order on two issues, one, a bit more general, as to why it is so important to be talking the balanced budget and, then, second, this issue of the continuing resolution.

It may well be these points were covered far better by speakers prior to me, in which case you may reclaim the time. So indicate.

Let me just take a moment because we correctly have focused upon the hardship to the Federal employees, the hardship to those with contracts with the Federal Government, to those who depend upon the Federal Government at least in part for necessities of life. It is appropriate that we do.

But it is even more appropriate to focus upon the hardship to the next generation who are not here to vote, whose money we spend every year, that we deal with a budget that is not balanced. It is really the worst form of democratic misrepresentation where people who do not have the vote are taxed by people who do.

Democrats and Republicans alike have participated in building the budget debt to where it is today, and the deficit each year being out of balance adds to it.

When I had the honor to serve here before, we did not balance the budget, and the President at that time was Republican. So let us just put that issue to one side.

What is critical for the American people to understand, and what I hope I have some effect in raising, is the unethical, immoral nature of our spending the next generation's money. That is the No. 1 and principal reason why we need to focus upon a balanced budget.

Second, the baby-boomers are going to be in their retirement years in 15 years. Now, every actuarial assumption about Medicare and Social Security falls through the cracks when you have that huge influx of retirees coming into their Social Security and Medicare recipient years. We have got 15 years.

If we spend 7 of those getting to a zero deficit, we then ought to spend the remaining 8 to build up a surplus. If we go into those retirement years of the baby-boomers without a surplus, God help us, God help us. We will not have the funds to treat them fairly. There will not be a Medicare for those who would be retiring 15 years from now, a second reason for the appropriate focus on this budget.

Third, the debt of the United States is unlike the debt of almost every other developed economy. It is not predominantly financed at the present auctions the way other countries do. We rely upon foreign investment to purchase our Treasury bonds for the new auctions, and every time we do that, we put our economic future in the hands of others, and that is a tremendous risk when you contemplate the amount of debt that we add up and the claims upon that debt by those who are not citizens, participants in the United States.

Now, that is why it is appropriate for us to consider the deficit, the debt, and the unfairness that it brings to the next generation. What about the continuing resolution that brings us to the floor tonight?

I thank the gentleman for yielding and pointing out that I was recently elected to this body, and it was an honor to be selected by the people of the 15th District of California.

I had one message, one message in my campaign. It was, ''If you elect me, I will do my utmost to vote to balance the budget.''

And I will stay here as long as it takes, if that means giving up vacation, which it did, if it means giving up my paycheck, which it does, I and a number of others, I understand, have voluntarily given back our paychecks to show the seriousness of our resolve on this matter.

Thirty days ago, roughly speaking the President agreed that he would put forward a plan. It would not necessarily be one that you or I, Mr. Speaker, would agree to, but he agreed to a plan, and it would balance the budget in 7 years, using honest methods of measuring, and the Republicans were going to put forward their plan, and then we would sit down and hash it out between the two, and in return we agreed to keep the Government operating through continuing resolution.

The President did not put forward that plan, and instead negotiations are of a one-sided nature. To have a continuing resolution tonight, therefore, is to invite similar response. If we were to concede to business as usual, we would say ''yes'' to a continuing resolution, and if we did that, we would be postponing yet again the time when we actually balance our Federal budget.

But critically to the present context, we would be saying it is all right if you go back on what you pledged you would do; put your own proposal forward.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President to come forward with his proposal that balances the budget in 7 years using honest scoring. It can have no tax cut at all; that would be all right with me. It might have totally different numbers for Medicare and Medicaid; that would be all right with me. But we have to have something from which to deal, and I am very worried if we say all right to a continuing resolution before we have that, that we will never have that.

The last point I want to raise draws from my previous experience in this body, 1988 to 1992. I remember we came upon those years coming out of the years of President Reagan, and there had been a continuing resolution for a substantial part of the time that President Reagan was in office for his first term and the deficit grew.

□ 2100

If you want to postpone what we must do, business as usual says ''continuing resolution.''

Mr. Speaker, I was not elected to do business as usual. If we miss this chance, we miss the last chance, the best opportunity, to be fair to the next generation. I urge my colleagues not to give up on that opportunity; not to be unfair to the next generation, as previous generations have been by building up debt upon them. but to say to them ''We will give you something better. We will give you at least a chance at a balance, a clean slate in financial terms.'' To do that, the sacrifices that must be made, which I believe my constituents are willing to sustain.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITE). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, during the course of these special orders, is it in order or appropriate, even though I control the time for this hour as the designee of the majority leader, is it appropriate to find some way to yield the time in an orderly fashion so we might invite our friends from the minority to engage in a dialogue about the future of this country? For example, in 3-minute allotments to each side. Indeed, if I may be so bold and with unanimous consent from my friends from the Democratic side, to perhaps continue this through the following hour, as they are the designees of the minority leader? What would be in order?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that he controls the time and he has the right to yield time under whatever conditions he may wish to impose.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I would control the next hour, and would be happy to agree for the following hour after the next 45 minutes that the gentleman from Arizona controls; I would continue that exact same procedure on a 3-minute type basis.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If that is fine, we would ask the Chair's indulgence and that of the timekeeper to allow us to know when 3-minute increments expire. Is that appropriate? Could we do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would advise the gentleman that the gentleman should keep his own time by watching the clock that is on the floor. Otherwise he is perfectly entitled to yield as he sees fit.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I certainly, certainly appreciate the Chair's reliance on self-sufficiency. I am armed with the second hand of my watch from my alma mater, which is altogether reliable. With that in mind I would be happy to yield 3 minutes to my friend from Florida.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Thank you. I appreciate this. I think this is what we should be doing in really having a dialogue. That is a lot more healthy in