

or to the CR, when it would appear that the tolerance of the American people for this gridlock is way down.

What is wrong with the strategy of dirty CR's and dirty debt-limit bills? Besides the fact that you do not want to stop the Government or put the full faith and credit of the United States in any doubt, one might begin with the fact that it is not working or it has long since stopped working. You got the President to the table with a 7-year balanced budget. If victory had been declared then we might be somewhere.

But more seriously, this strategy is outside of the constitutional framework, and that is why it is stopping up this place. I teach a course at Georgetown, where I was a law professor, called Lawmaking and Statutory Interpretation. This gridlock has made me think about the course and about what we are doing in a deeper fashion.

What we are doing is outside of the constitutional framework. It is not that it is unconstitutional; it is indeed an abuse of the Constitution, because it thwarts the intent of the Framers.

Now, conservatives pride themselves on being what we in academic law call originalists. They insist upon going back to the Framers for everything, and it gets very awkward because very often the Framers did not even think about certain things. But here I think it is legitimate task, what did Thomas Jefferson and what did James Madison intend, what did they have in mind?

We have heard the argument on the floor here that the Government is shut down or the debt limit will not rise because the President did something, the President vetoed it.

My friends, the veto was not meant by the Framers to produce any counter weapon here in this House. Once there is a veto, three things are possible: A negotiated solution, let the matter stand, or overrule the veto with a supermajority.

The Framers did not build a system that did not have cloture. What we are doing in this body now, 200 years after the Constitution was passed, is creating a system without cloture, where there is point-counterpoint, shutdown of the Government following a veto. The Framers were more brilliant than that. They knew that if you could not bring cloture at some point, the Government could not operate.

We have, in fact, done that. What we have done is to give new meaning to the word "gridlock." First, we have created the word the Framers never intended. The Framers never intended that the Government would be paralyzed.

Now, the gridlock that was the slogan of the last Congress have come back in ways that no one ever dreamed of, and if you think, particularly you on the other side of the aisle, that people sent you here to make gridlock worse, I think you got a big surprise coming for you when you go home to your primaries and when you go home in November.

We must not introduce gridlock into a brilliant system that has its own built-in cloture. Do not blame the President for using the veto. The Framers intended that. Show me where the Framers intended to allow you to shut down the Government? Show me where the Framers intended for you to allow a game of chicken to be played with the debt limit of the United States? The were much too brilliant, much too thoughtful to leave the system in that state.

We must not try to undo their brilliant work. What we must do is what the originalists, the conservatives, have always insisted upon doing. We have lost our compass. We have lost our way.

Let us open the Constitution, try to find the original meaning in the structure of checks and balances, and understand that the veto was meant to produce civilized responses, and not to take the Government out. It is too late in the game, and it is too late in the day, for us to try to upset and wreck a brilliant system of Government. History will not forget us or forgive us if we allow this to happen.

TRIBUTE TO HON. MIKE SYNAR

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, as Sandy and I joined in that overflow crowd today in the St. John's Episcopal Church to celebrate the life of Mike Synar, I looked around and I realized what an incredibly vital person Mike was, as every person in that church felt a personal tie to Mike; someone who was so full of energy, so full of life, so full of commitment, so full of passion for what he did; and how someone in such a short life span, a life of only 45 years, could mean so much to so many people, not only in that church, but people across this country, who felt a personal kinship to Mike.

One of my early memories of Mike is I invited him, when I was a new Member, to come to our district to our annual senior citizen convention. I remember Mike grabbing the microphone, he would not be contained by lecterns and podiums and stages and things like that, grabbing that microphone and charging into this crowd of several hundred people. He did not know them; it did not matter. They were people, and he was incredibly empathetic, and his infectious enthusiasm revved them up as well.

That enthusiasm characterized Mike's whole life, and certainly his service in this Chamber, because in many ways his service in this Chamber was his life, 16 years of service, being elected at a very, very early age.

Courage is another word that describes Mike. The previous speaker spoke eloquently about the Framers of the Constitution. Mike was the most ardent defender of those Framers. If

the Congress violated the will of the Framers, Mike knew how to take care of that.

He went to the U.S. Supreme Court. That is what the Constitution said to do. I remember particularly one piece of legislation, I believe it was the Gramm-Rudman bill, he went and won. Do you know how popular it was to take on a so-called balanced budget provision and get it struck down on legal grounds? Mike did, and won, and forced this Congress, of course, to do it properly.

Mike could be a policy wonk, but he was one of the few people I know that combined policy and commitment. He knew the ins and outs of legislation. He could get very excited about how the words were phrased and what this word was and how it fit in the context of the overall passage.

But he was not just a policy wonk. At the same time he was out there organizing people. He was a grassroots organizer, one of the best I have ever seen; not only organizing people in the grass roots at his district or across the country, but organizing people in this Chamber. He always was asking "What can I do to help," and he meant it.

Mike was never bitter. He certainly had some setbacks. I remember one time one of his many causes, one he believed passionately in, as he believed passionately in so many things, was campaign reform.

□ 1615

In order to get a bill passed, a decision was made by those whom he had been working with to go with a lesser version, and so in the last moments before the vote was taken, the message went out, "Vote for the lesser version to try and get something through." In many ways, I guess, that undercut what Mike was doing. I asked him whether he was bitter, and he just smiled and said, "That is the way the process is and we will try and go get the rest later."

I have mentioned reform several times. I guess change or reform would have to be what characterized Mike Synar. He was always fighting for reform and change. Regardless of the issue, you could disagree with Mike on an issue. He would work with you, and he would argue with you and he would realize that he would have to go some place else, but he would come back and work with you on the next issue.

He brought a lot of change and much reform to this country. One of his greatest issues, and he would want me to mention it as he dedicated much of his time even after his leaving the Congress, was campaign reform. Mike believed that the strength of this body is how we get people here, and that is a battle that still must be fought. My hope is that when it is, we recognize the role that Mike Synar had in bringing us to this day.

Mr. Speaker, Mike was one of the few people I know that took no PAC contributions and had a very strict limitation on individual contributions, and

yet through a grassroots effort was able to raise the amounts of money that he needed to wage very difficult campaign battles.

Mike was 45 years only when he died. Not many of us who have lived much longer could have accomplished what he did.

The test, Mike, of someone's life is how much you leave in others. You leave a lot in a lot of us. We carry on much better because we know that you are behind us and we know the example that you have set for us.

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

[Mr. SHAYS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

TRIBUTE TO MIKE SYNAR

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to follow up in part of my 5 minutes and also pay tribute to Mike Synar as my colleague from West Virginia just did.

Mike Synar was the first person, actually, from Washington, or a Congressman, if you will, who came down when I first ran for election in 1988. He was also a champion of the environment, and I was largely elected to Congress back in 1988 because during that summer in New Jersey we had our beaches closed and huge washups of debris that came ashore and caused us to lose billions of dollars in our tourism industry.

Mike came down as a leading environmentalist in Congress and did a press conference with me and met with some of the editorial boards. It was for the first time I saw him on the train coming from New York to New Jersey. I never met anybody who was so dynamic and cared so much about the environment and about the principles of the Democratic Party and the Nation as a whole.

I watched him here. He was sort of a mentor in a way because he was on the Committee on Commerce, then it was called the Energy and Commerce Committee, which is the committee that I am now on, that deals so much with environmental issues. He encouraged me to become a member of the committee and helped me to get on the committee. I often looked to him for advice.

He was almost exactly the same age that I am, and when I heard about his illness and when I heard that he had actually passed away, I was very saddened because there really were very few people in the House of Representatives who had the dynamism, who cared so much about his country, who cared so much about the principles

that he espoused and was able to translate that into action. He will be sorely missed.

BUDGET CUTS IMPACT ON EDUCATION

Mr. Speaker, I came here today because I was concerned about the budget and where we are going in terms of education programs in this country. Last night during the State of the Union address, President Clinton stressed education. He stressed the need for a properly educated America because of the challenges that we face in the future, particularly with regard to job opportunities, competing in the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame, and he certainly challenged the Congress to do something about it, but it is a shame that in the last year in this House of Representatives the Republican majority has really cut funding for education programs, whether it is on the secondary school level or the higher education level. I think over the next few months, unless something dramatically changes and the Republican leadership decides that they are going to prioritize education as they promised, we are going to see dramatic change in the ability of our schools and our colleges to provide affordable educational opportunities for the average American.

The budget, as many of us know, manifests itself in many ways. There has not been appropriation for the Education Department. The budget that the Republicans passed actually cuts back significantly on a number of education programs. The CR, the continuing resolution that we are operating under now that was proposed by the Republican majority, cuts funding or lets the Department operate its various education programs at significantly lower levels than what is necessary to keep going with the programs that we have.

Already, we are beginning to hear that some of the Republican suggestions for spending or appropriation levels for next year will also severely impact our educational programs.

One of the things I am most concerned about is the GOP proposal to eliminate \$1.9 million in direct student loans. They do not favor the direct student loan program. In the last couple of years, the Democrats put forward this new program where the loans would be coming directly from the colleges and universities rather than banks and financial institutions.

In my district, at Rutgers University, Rutgers has been able to take advantage of this program and provide a lot more loans to a lot more students than would be available under the existing institutional student loan program. Officials at Rutgers, and a lot of other colleges in the State, have told me that if this program is abolished or limited, as the Republicans propose, to certain schools and eventually phased out, that there will be a lot less student loans available.

We have also seen programs with the Pell Grants because of the shutdown

and the uncertainty. The Education Department now really does not know what kind of schedule or information it can provide to the colleges and universities about student loan availability for next year or Pell Grants and other higher education grant availability for next year.

I think that what the Republican majority is forgetting is that when we talk about higher education loans or grant programs, students need to know in advance what kind of funding levels are available and what kind of student loans are available. This process of shutting down the Government and not having an appropriations bill, not being able to plan for next September or even next semester is having a terrible impact on our educational programs.

Mr. Speaker, we need to wise up and prioritize education. That is what President Clinton said last night, and I hope the Republican leadership gets the message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN, is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. KILDEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

CUTS IN EDUCATION FUNDING COULD RESULT IN HUMAN DEFICIT

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, our children's future is at risk as the Republican Congress is defunding education. I very much agree with my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. PALLONE, and his comments about education, especially higher education.

The initial 7-year budget plan, in fact, sliced \$10 billion out of the higher education loan and grant programs. Now, since then, some of the message has gotten through and that has not persisted in the final version of the budget. But, nevertheless, they in fact deauthorized the direct lending program, which will indeed mean that the dollars do not go as far in terms of